

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

is the thought of our day passing from Christ to God? Canon J. M. WILSON thinks it is. Before the War men asked to see Jesus: now they ask to see God. He quotes the saying of a soldier in hospital: 'I'm a *Christian* all right, Padre; it's what the parsons say about *God* that stumps me.'

But Canon WILSON does not therefore leave Christ on one side. In the Cathedral at Worcester he has preached a series of ten sermons about God. But he knows that he cannot preach about God without preaching about Christ. For it is not some philosophical conception of God that he preaches, nor even some theological conception, it is the conception which Christ has given. And so, when he came to publish his sermons he gave them this title: *Christ's Thought of God* (Macmillan; 5s. net).

Now the special thought of God which Canon WILSON finds in Christ is an unexpected thought. And he finds it in an unexpected text.

The text is Lk 22⁶⁹. In the Authorized Version it reads: 'Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God.' But Canon WILSON will not have that version. The opening phrase cannot mean 'hereafter.' The Greek is absolutely clear and can only mean, as the Revisers have it, 'from henceforth.' Again the title 'Son

of man' is not, he says, a title here of Christ. It signifies mankind. And finally to sit on the right hand (or as the Revisers translate, 'be seated at the right hand') of the power of God means to be within reach of God's power so as to be able to use it. Now we do not need to ascend to heaven in order to be within reach of God's power, it is enough that God comes down to us.

Jesus made a new revelation of God that day. And it was like Him to make it to Caiaphas. What Caiaphas might take out of it at the moment we do not know. But it would stay with him beyond the moment, to make him think. What was the revelation?

It was the revelation of the fact that from that moment mankind would cease to look upon God as dwelling at a distance. From that moment, and henceforth through all time, God would be known to be present with men, both with them and in them. In the enjoyment of His presence in their hearts and lives men would be in harmony with the will of God and able to use His power as they endeavoured to make His will prevail in the world. To be seated at the right hand of God is to be in harmony with Him in all His purposes. In the language of St. Paul it is to have Christ dwelling in the heart by faith. In the language of St. John it is for men so to love God that He will

love them and will come unto them and make His abode with them. Henceforth, said Jesus, as Canon WILSON interprets Him, men like Caiaphas will with their own astonished eyes see mankind living in the love of God and so using the power of God that they will be able to say, 'We can do all things.' It is that word of warning to Caiaphas which was afterwards a word of encouragement to the disciples—'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.'

If it is Evolution that has brought us into the present difficulty about the Supernatural, it is Evolution that will take us out again. That there is a way out no one need doubt. Not even Canon Sanday, with his incomparable singleness of heart and seductiveness of language, can persuade us that all the miracles of the New Testament are capable of being 'explained.' It is not the consequence of their explanation that we fear. God will look after consequences. Our objection to the explanatory method is that it does not explain.

Evolution will show us the way out. The present Bishop of Bloemfontein, Dr. Arthur CHANDLER, is one of the keenest and sanest thinkers of our day. He has already written three or four books. In every one of them he is in touch with modern thought, in every one he provokes further thought in his readers. To his latest book he gives the title of *Scala Mundi* (Methuen; 4s. 6d. net). In that book Dr. CHANDLER shows how Evolution is able to rescue us from the present difficulty about the Supernatural.

The difficulty is due to Science. Scientific observers say that the Universe is under the sway of laws which are inviolable. Their value lies in their inviolability. If we cannot depend upon them they are useless. To say that they are subject to 'interference' is to say that they are not laws. If a law of nature like gravitation can be suspended at the incalculable will of some superior

Power, it is no longer a law of nature. That is the scientific position.

It is a scientific difficulty. And it is immediately due to Evolution. For Evolution eliminates 'interference.' To all outsiders it says, Hands off. The power to evolve is there, and it will work its own salvation. The whole evolution theory is understood to rest upon the absolute sway of natural law. If the Christian believer feels that Christianity stands or falls with the Supernatural, the believer in Evolution is confident that the acceptance of miracle will be the end of Evolution.

The BISHOP OF BLOEMFONTEIN is a believer in Evolution. If he differs from any other evolutionist it is only in the whole-heartedness of his belief. It is his whole-hearted belief in it that makes him insist upon Evolution being carried all the way. Is Evolution true in the sphere of inorganic matter? It is true also in the sphere of organic life. It is true in the sphere of human personality. It is true in the sphere of life (supposing there is such life) that is both human and divine.

Dr. CHANDLER gives Evolution full scope and exercise in the sphere of inorganic matter. But he asks of the evolutionist what right he has to confine it to inorganic matter. He demands not less but more in the sway of law than the physical evolutionist. And he has a right to demand it. He demands the application of law, that is, of regular, reliable order, to every department of life and being. You insist upon the rigid rule within the inorganic kingdom? he says to the evolutionist. Carry it further. The inorganic world is not the only world. The way to higher worlds is open and continuous. Forward and fear not.

The physical evolutionist says that law has absolute authority within the physical sphere. But the physical sphere is not a closed system—except to the materialist, and there are few materialists now. Pass into the next sphere. It is the sphere

of animal life and behaviour. It is equally subject to law. Its laws are not the same as in the mechanical sphere. They are modified by the advent of that new fact called Life. But they are laws. More difficult to discover, when discovered they are as reliable as mechanical laws.

Pass on again. What right has any evolutionist to close the reign of law at the animal stage? The next sphere is the human. Again there is unflinching obedience to law, when it is discovered. It is not mechanical law, and it is not animal law alone; it includes both; but the introduction of conscience gives it more complexity as well as more importance.

Pass on once more. What right has any evolutionist to close the evolutionary system with the advent of man? Though we have nearly reached the limit of our conceptions, we are still able to conceive one higher sphere. It is the sphere of the human and divine. If God becomes man and dwells among us, there is a new system in this world. And the new system will be amenable to law not less surely than any of the old systems.

If then, says the BISHOP OF BLOEMFONTEIN, 'in the case of Jesus Christ we recognize a new and higher grade of existence, we shall naturally expect His actions to express that higher life, and to differ from our own in their motives and scope and power. The last point, the power of these actions, is the one we want to deal with now.'

'It brings us face to face with the "miracles" of Christ. And in this connexion the first point to get clear about is, that we do not regard these miracles as "exceptions to the laws of nature"—a perfectly idiotic and preposterous idea which Christians are sometimes supposed to entertain. It is simply impossible to believe in a thing as an exception to something else; if we believe in it, we believe in it as an outcome of some power adequate to produce it. And we simply apply to the actions of Christ a principle of universal

application, namely, that within the universe of truth there are different levels of being, that at each higher level a fresh power emerges and operates, and that in each case the new actions are of a sort which would be abnormal or miraculous on the levels below.'

'Thus it is natural for a cabbage, which has organic life, to grow and expand in a manner which would be miraculous in the case of a stone or a star, which latter are subject simply to chemical and physical laws. It is, again, natural for a man, who possesses personal conscious life, to form a system of knowledge and a scheme of life, which would be miraculous in lower organisms, vegetable or animal, subject to the laws of physiology. And so, lastly, it is natural for Christ, who has the nature of God Incarnate, to exercise powers which would be miraculous for men limited in their actions by the laws of psychology.'

'And in every case, the phenomena which would be miraculous on the lower level, become natural on the higher, just because on that level there exists a power adequate to their production. When a new power has emerged, it is absurd to cavil at the new ways in which it manifests itself; absurd to deny that a dog can grow and move, because a flint can do neither; absurd to deny that a man can talk, and choose between right and wrong, because a dog can do neither; absurd to deny that Christ could multiply loaves or walk on the sea, because we can do neither. Each higher power, as it comes forth, manifests itself in ways which are natural and normal for it, however abnormal or miraculous they would be in spheres below.'

'It would seem, then, that the term "miraculous" is a relative term, applied from below to describe an output of power which cannot be expected there, because there is no cause capable of producing it on that particular level. A perambulating cabbage, or a calculating pig, would be freakish, abnormal, miraculous, whilst at

the same time perambulation is natural for a pig and calculation for a man. Thus Christ's mighty works are miracles from our point of view, whilst being at the same time natural and normal exhibitions, "signs," as St. John calls them, of a power present in Him and not in us.'

'And in all these actions there is no unwarrantable incursion of an alien power, upsetting and confounding an orderly system of natural law: that is the old fallacy of the closed system. Rather such action is an indication and an outcome of a fact of supreme importance, namely, that the universe is spiritual from end to end; that it awakes to its true nature in God; and that, equally in its ordinary modes of action and in those which we call miraculous, it is the spiritual will of God which is its creative and sustaining and ruling power. Since the whole development leads up to God, and finds its meaning and explanation there, we must read God's will backwards into all the lower spheres, with the result that the whole universe will be spiritual in ultimate character, dominated and permeated by that which is its one true life.'

'Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God, to the saints which are at Ephesus.' 'To the saints which are at Ephesus'—who would they be? Where would the post-runner find them? If Paul had sent a letter to London, Edinburgh, Dublin with this address? 'To the saints which are in Edinburgh,' who would claim it?

Not we. Certainly not. We do not lay claim to so much goodness as that. We will let no one challenge our moral life. But we do not quite set up to be saints. Wordsworth's ideal woman—

A creature not too bright or good
For human nature's daily food—

is enough for us. To the saints? No saints in Edinburgh, try Aberdeen.

But we are making a mistake. That is not what

'saint' means. It has no reference to goodness, much or little. We refuse the letter addressed to the saints because we are not good enough. But Paul did not call the company in Ephesus who received the letter 'saints' because they were good. In point of fact they were not good, not so good, it is to be hoped, as we are. And yet he had no hesitation in calling them saints.

There are three words which we have to understand. 'Saints' is one of them. The other two are 'sinners' and 'righteous.' When Jesus began His ministry He found the people divided into 'the sinners' (οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί) and 'the righteous' (οἱ δίκαιοι). The sinners knew that they were wrong. The righteous believed that they were right. Jesus showed the righteous that they also were wrong. He accepted what they did for what it was worth, but it was not worth much. They were trying to do right without being right. In various ways He showed them that that was all a mistake.

One way was by parables. He told the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican. The publican was wrong and knew it: 'God be merciful to me the sinner.' The pharisee was wrong also, but did not know it: 'God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are.' And after the prayer, after the repentance, 'the *sinner* went down to his house justified rather than the other.'

He told the Parable of the Prodigal Son. That parable shows us the two classes clearly. The younger son is one of 'the sinners,' the elder is one of 'the righteous.' The sinner does wrong and comes to know it. His righteous brother is wrong and does not see it. But we see it. We see with quite astonishing clearness that though he has served his father 'these many years' and 'never has transgressed a commandment,' yet he is all wrong.

He is not at one with his father, and never has been. He has been a servant, not a son. It all

comes out when the younger son returns. The father welcomes him, the brother resents the welcome. He has no joy at his brother's return, as he had probably no sorrow at his departure: 'He has made his bed, let him lie on't.' The father loves the prodigal, has loved him all along and looked for his return. The elder son has no love for either brother or father. To do right he must be right, and to be right he must be right with his father.

The father is God. The sinners and the righteous are both out of harmony with God. They do not see things as God sees them, and therefore they do not do things as God would do them. But there is a difference. It is quite startling to find Christ setting the sinners before the righteous, as He does. But the reason is that the spirit of the sinners was often right though their deeds were wrong, while the deeds of the righteous were often right though their spirit was wrong. And it is worse to be wrong in spirit than in deed.

Jesus made this clear in the Parable of the Two Sons. The father came to one of the sons and said, Go, work in my vineyard. He said, I go, sir; but went not. He came to the other. He refused to go, but went. The one was outwardly obedient but inwardly rebellious. The other was outwardly rebellious but inwardly obedient. It was the inwardly obedient son that did the will of his father.

Now when Jesus dealt with these two classes, He dealt with them both alike. To both He said that they must begin again. In the case of the sinners that was comparatively easy, for all that they had to do was to repent of their sinfulness. In the case of the righteous it was very difficult. For them also, however, there was nothing else for it; they must begin again. They must get right with God first. Then they would be able to do right.

How were they to get right with God? Jesus

explained very simply, Paul very elaborately. Jesus said, Follow me. He was at one with God. 'I and the Father are one.' 'I do always that which pleases him.' To be at one with Jesus was to be at one with God. He called this oneness Love. 'If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him.' To be right with God was to love the Lord Jesus Christ.

So said Paul also. But he had a most elaborate story to tell of the way by which a man is brought to love the Lord. It is the story of the at-onement. As soon as we use the word we spell it with a capital letter and are occupied with the doctrine of the Atonement. And why not? This *is* the way of becoming right with God. Jesus *has* to die on the Cross. We have to die with Him. Jesus has to rise again from the dead. We have to rise in Him. It is elaborate, but it is all true and verifiable in experience. Paul has not gone one step astray from the Master. His 'I am crucified with Christ' is just the theology of 'Come, take up your cross, and follow me.'

What are we to call them when they follow? We need a new name. 'The sinners' (*οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί*) will not do. 'The righteous' (*οἱ δίκαιοι*) will not do. We will call them 'the saints'; that is, the holy ones (*οἱ ἅγιοι*). It is a good name, for the point of it is that they are one with God, who is the Holy One.

Yes, the saints are those who are right with God. They are not those who have done right. They may not yet have done one truly right thing. In any case, it is not because they have done right that they are called saints. It is because they *are* right.

How Paul insists upon it! He insists upon it so determinedly that we have had to coin a word to distinguish the fact of being right from the fact of doing right. The one we have called Justification, the other Sanctification. And no one can read the Pauline Epistles—no scholar does read them

now—without perceiving that when Paul says a man is justified he does not mean that he is doing right, he means that he *is* right.

Now it is possible for a man to be called a saint though he is not a saint. How are we to know that a man is right with God? By his deeds. If he is right, he will do right. Justification is not sanctification; but if justification is not followed by sanctification, it is not justification. What is the difference then between the righteous and the saints? How can we tell that the righteous are not saints, and the saints not simply righteous? By the kind of deeds they do.

Christina Rossetti will tell us:

I saw a Saint.—How canst thou tell that he
Thou sawest was a Saint?—

I saw one like to Christ so luminously

By patient deeds of love, his mortal taint
Seemed made his groundwork for humility.

And when he marked me downcast utterly
Where foul I sat and faint,
Then more than ever Christ-like kindled he;
And welcomed me as I had been a saint,
Tenderly stooping low to comfort me.

Christ bade him, 'Do thou likewise.' Where-
fore he

Waxed zealous to acquaint
His soul with sin and sorrow, if so be
He might retrieve some latent saint:—
'Lo, I, with the child God hath given to me!'

Two things are characteristic of the saint, two classes of deeds—likeness to Christ (who went about doing good), and the discovery of other saints. The 'righteous' are never luminously like Christ, and they have no skill in the discovery of saints. Christina Rossetti might have been expounding the Parable of the Prodigal Son. The elder brother was most unlike the father, and he had no eyes for the saintship—the latent saintship—of his younger brother.

Still it must be admitted that it is not always easy, and perhaps it is not always possible for men, to distinguish the saints from the righteous. It may be that the tares will remain among the wheat undetected even by the servants of the Husbandman. It may be that this one and that will enter into the marriage feast without the wedding-garment. But the detection is at the last inevitable. 'Friend, how camest thou in hither not having a wedding-garment?' And he was speechless. His good deeds had been the doing of his duty. Until this moment he expected the credit due to them. But now he is speechless. 'Then the king said to the servants, Bind him hand and foot, and cast him out into the outer darkness; there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth. For many are called, but few chosen.'

Is it possible for a man who has once been set right with God to go wrong again? The question has an old world flavour about it. We do not ask these questions now. There is a doctrine called the Perseverance of the Saints. It has been tossed to and fro among the theologians; it has got tattered and torn. We are not greatly concerned now about the Perseverance of the Saints.

But the question has a practical interest. There is a real human value in it. As theology, as the Perseverance of the Saints, it may be worn out and worthless. But as the most unmistakable test of the life we are living, its worth can scarcely be overestimated.

For there is a practical test by which a man may know if after he has been set right with God he may go wrong again. It is the test of forgiveness. The way by which a man is made one with God is by being forgiven. The way by which he may lose his fellowship is by refusing to forgive.

We have it best in one of the parables. It is the Parable of the Unmerciful Servant. He owed

his master a debt, a monstrous debt. Dr. SWETE estimates it at two million and four hundred thousand pounds. When he begged for time (which plainly would have been of little use to him) he was forgiven. He asked for forbearance; he obtained forgiveness. That is God's way with sinners. The debt is immeasurable. As long as the sinner is sinning God is long-suffering; the moment he repents God forgives him. That is the Gospel.

The servant was set right with his master. What did he do then? He went out and met a fellow-servant, who owed him the miserable sum of three pound nineteen and twopence. He refused to forgive him; he refused to give him time to pay; he seized him by the throat and thrust him into prison. And when the master of these servants heard of it he cancelled the forgiveness, and not only sent the unforgiving servant to prison, which was hopeless enough, but delivered him to the tormentors—the 'hard labour' of our day—so that, as our Lord expressed it on another occasion, the last state of that man was worse than the first.

But does the parable apply to the sinner? Dr. SWETE has no doubt of it. We are referring to his newly issued book on *The Parables of the Kingdom* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). 'Must we not say'—these are Dr. SWETE's words—'that the act of the King who cancels his own pardon belongs only to the imagery of the parable, and not to the innermost truth of things? But our Lord's own words which follow the parable seem intended to guard against this view: "So also" as this King did, "so also shall my heavenly Father do unto you, if ye forgive not every one his brother from your hearts."'

So then, a man may fall from grace—has fallen from grace—if he refuses to forgive some other man. Could a simpler test be thought of? Could a severer? How many of us can forgive? In the April issue of *The Harvard Theological Review*

there is an article by Professor G. H. PALMER on the Lord's Prayer. Professor PALMER has difficulty with one of the petitions of the Prayer. It is the petition about forgiveness. He sees that there also God's forgiveness is conditional on our forgiveness. And it is so hard to forgive. 'For forgiveness goes against our natural instincts and its very possibility may be doubted.'

Professor SWETE does not doubt its possibility. And yet he sees, as clearly as Professor PALMER, that forgiveness is not a light thing. It is not enough to say we forgive. It is sheer futility to say we may forgive but cannot forget. Forgiveness must be from the heart: 'So also shall my heavenly Father do unto you, if ye forgive not every one his brother *from your hearts*.'

And yet, hard as it is, and harder as that condition makes it, we have only to consider a moment to see that it must be so. God is a forgiving God—Can you utter a surer word about Him? If a man is unforgiving, how can he be in harmony with God? Look at the Parable of the Prodigal Son. What was wrong with the elder son was that he was out of sympathy with his father. How did he show that he was out of sympathy? By refusing to forgive his brother.

But after all——. Now there is nothing more dangerous than to add a 'but after all' to the demands of Christ. Yet Dr. SWETE does it. But after all, he says, 'there are circumstances in which it is not only permissible, but a duty to prosecute and to punish. Only, in such cases the prosecutor or person who punishes must make it a matter of conscience to ascertain that he is not actuated by a vindictive or an unforgiving spirit. It is the animus of the servant in the parable which is forbidden, not the simple recovery of a debt. In the same way, the parable does not require in private life the resumption of intimate relations with a person who has shewn himself unworthy of them. There may be full *ex animo* forgiveness of a wrong, and no personal sense

whatever of soreness or ill-will towards the offender, and yet common sense and the desire to avoid future occasion of friction may dictate a policy of aloofness for the time to come. As long as the Kingdom of Heaven is among men on earth, such limitations to human fellowship are inevitable, and the effort to ignore them is utopian; but it is always possible for the true subjects of the

Kingdom to forgive from their hearts even those with whom they cannot freely associate. God does not ask impossibility from His servants; the Christian rule is well given by St. Paul: "If it be possible, as much as in you lieth, be at peace with all men"; and again, with special reference to fellow-members of the Church: "Forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you."

Job, Ecclesiastes, and a New Babylonian Literary Fragment.

BY G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.LITT., D.D., PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT
EXEGESIS IN MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

A BABYLONIAN text of considerable interest for students of the Old Testament has recently been published.¹ Ebeling, the editor of the text, draws attention to the parallelism, in respect both of form and contents, which it presents with the work of the Hebrew pessimist, the author of Ecclesiastes; but, although he describes the new text as a specimen of a class of literature hitherto undiscovered in Babylonia, viz. that of the philosophical dialogue, he does not comment on the parallelism in form which, in so far as the description is correct, it presents with the Book of Job. Slight as is its resemblance to Job, it is yet sufficient to deserve attention; and, after giving a translation of a part of the new text, I will return to consider its significance in connexion with Job.

The text is contained on two tablets in the Berlin Museum, and a small fragment in London. The two Berlin tablets overlap, so that for parts of the text there are two witnesses. On the other hand, the beginning of the dialogue is so far undiscovered, and in other parts the tablets are broken, and the text defective. As my purpose is merely to draw attention to the parallelism with Hebrew literary forms, and as that purpose will be sufficiently served by a translation of part of the Babylonian work, I give here a translation only of the last half (according to Ebeling's arrangement), which, except

in one or two lines, is free from mutilation, whereas the first half is much more mutilated and uncertain. For the present purpose, too, it is unnecessary to dwell in detail on the uncertainties or ambiguities in the translation which are dealt with in at least a preliminary way by Ebeling. The translation here given is mainly from Ebeling's German version, modified here and there by reference to the original text. In due time, no doubt, we may look for an English translation of the whole by a competent Assyriologist; and that, perhaps, not only of the fragments so far recovered, but of others which may still be lurking in London, and merely, as Ebeling suggests, awaiting fresh search to be discovered.

The dialogue consists of a series of sections, each section closely adhering to the same scheme. The sections that occur on both the Berlin tablets are not arranged in the same order in both; nor in the different texts is the line division always identical. But the sections are separated from one another by horizontal lines. I number the sections according to the enumeration of Ebeling's translation.

The interlocutors are a slave and his master; what each says is, generally speaking, perfectly obvious from the vocatives; but in VII. we may infer from the consistent scheme in other sections that the last two lines are spoken not by the master in continuation of l. 5, but by the slave; and in XII. the scheme suggests as the most probable dis-

¹ *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1918²; *Quellen zur Kenntnis der babylonische Religion*, bearbeitet von Erich Ebeling (Leipzig, 1919), pp. 50-70.

tribution: l. 2, master; ll. 3-6, slave; l. 7, master; l. 8, slave. With these preliminary explanations I give the translation:—

VII.

Slave, attend to me! Yes, my lord, yes.
I will raise a revolt (?). Yes, do so, my lord, do so.
If you raise not a revolt, what (or, empty) is your carcase (?).
Who will give to you to fill your belly?
No, slave, I will not raise a revolt.
The man who raises a revolt is killed, or (otherwise) it goes hard with him;
He is mutilated, or caught, or cast into prison.

VIII.

Slave, attend to me! Yes, my lord, yes.
I will love a woman. Yes, love, my lord, love!
A man who loves a woman forgets trouble and care.
No, slave, I will not love a woman. Love not, my lord, love not.
Woman is a pit (or cistern),¹ a hole that is dug:
Woman is an iron dagger, sharp, which cuts a man's throat.

IX.

Slave, attend to me! Yes, my lord, yes.
Fetch me straightway water for my hands: give it me; an offering will I make to my god.
Make it, my lord, make it. Merry is his heart who makes an offering to his god:
Loan upon loan he makes.
No, slave, I will not make an offering to my god.
Make it not, my lord, make it not!
The god wilt thou teach; like a dog will he follow thee,
Whether 'my ritual' or 'ask not' or ought else he desire of thee.

X.

Slave, attend to me! Yes, my lord, yes.
I will give food to my country. Give, my lord, give!
A man who gives food to his country, his barley is abundant (?).
No, slave, I will not give food to the country.
Give it not, my lord, give it not!
Creditors will devour thy barley: they will diminish thy barley: moreover, they will curse thee.

XI.

Slave, attend to me! Yes, my lord, yes.
Help will I give to my country. Give, my lord, give!
A man who gives help to his country
His own help lies in the urn of Marduk.
No, slave, I will not give help to my country.
Give it not, my lord, give it not.
Ascend the hills and traverse the dwellings(?):
Behold the skulls of the hindmost and the foremost.
Where is the harmful, where is the helpful?

¹ A pit to entrap some one.

XII.

Slave, attend to me! Yes, my lord, yes.
Now, what is good?
To break my neck and thy neck,
To cast into the river—that is good.
Where is the hindmost who ascended to heaven?
Where is the great who captured (?) the (whole) earth?
No, slave, I will kill thee, I will send thee before me.
And, my lord, three days after, how will they live after me!

These six sections of the dialogue suffice to indicate the general character of the whole. The writer balances the advantages and disadvantages of various courses of action; the master proposes a certain course of action; the slave acquiesces, and suggests certain advantages that may accrue from it. Then the master proposes not to do what at first he had proposed to do, and the slave is ready to point out what is disadvantageous in such a course. The dialogue, in addition to the activities referred to in the sections here translated, discusses, in those not here translated, attendance at court, dining, hunting, house-building.

The dialogue thus implies a critical outlook on life: the writer can see advantages and disadvantages in any form of human activity; but the outlook is ultimately pessimistic; for in each section the reasons against any course of action follow and apparently cancel the reasons in favour of it; and in the last section the conclusion seems to be that death is better than life; but still balancing the pros and cons, and not quite resolved whether himself to be or not to be, the master proposes by slaying him to give the slave the chance of putting the great question to the test; and, if we may so interpret the obscure closing line, the slave retorts by pointing out that in this course, too, there is a disadvantage; for without the slave, how will the master fare?

It is in the critical and ultimately pessimistic outlook on life that the Babylonian dialogue offers a parallel to Ecclesiastes: like the Babylonian, the Hebrew writer can find relative advantages for any kind of human activity; 'to every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven' (Ec 3¹), and the various sections of the Babylonian dialogue develop the double-sidedness of all activities which Ecclesiastes expresses by saying that 'there is a time to plant, and a time to pluck up that which is planted,' a time to break down, and a time to build up, etc.; or, again, in his advice not to be either righteous or wicked

overmuch, for there are disadvantages as well as advantages attendant on righteousness, and the same is true of wickedness (7^{16f.}). And, as in the dialogue, the final word each time is against any and every form of activity, so in Ecclesiastes the refrain is: 'This also is vanity'; the starting-point, which gives tone to the whole book, is the question: What profit hath a man of all his labour wherever he laboureth under the sun? and the conclusion is that the day of death is better than the day of birth (7¹).

It is unnecessary to go further into detail to show that Ebeling was guided by a right instinct in detecting a parallelism between the contents of the dialogue and the contents of Ecclesiastes; or that the parallelism is most striking between the general tone and temper of the two works. The parallelism with Job on the other hand, in so far as it is to be detected, is almost entirely a parallelism of form. It is not, indeed, impossible to find parallel ideas or expressions; for in Job (ch. 3), too, we have a presentation of the idea that death is better than life; but this stands at the *beginning* in Job, and the book moves on to anything but a pessimistic conclusion. Moreover, in the treatment of this idea and throughout, the whole tone and temper of the two works is different; there is no passion in the Babylonian dialogue; in it life is regarded from a cool, calculating, utilitarian standpoint utterly different from the standpoint of Job. Again, there is in Job a criticism of God as currently represented, but nothing approaching the low irreverence of the last line but one of section IX. of the dialogue.

But the parallelism in form with Job, slight as it is, is of great interest. So much in Hebrew literature has been related to Babylonian thought or literary form that it has proved tempting to search for Babylonian parallels to Job, and even to attempt to trace back the great Hebrew poem to Babylonian sources. For a considerable time now fragments of a Babylonian poem have been known to which the name of the 'Babylonian Job'¹ has been given; and the relation of Job to this earlier Babylonian poem has been much discussed. This

¹ An English translation of part of the poem may be found in R. W. Rogers' *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, 164-169. An English translation of all known at the time, together with an exhaustive discussion, was contributed by Jastrow to the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1906, pp. 135-196. But fresh fragments have come to light since, and a new English translation is much needed.

poem tells, in the words of the sufferer himself, the story of a person of high rank, apparently a king, who, after a long life of prosperity, became a slave and fell sick, and was reduced to despair, though aware of no sin that could justify this change of fortune and having sought in vain to discover from the gods what was amiss. Subsequently the sufferer is released from his sins and sufferings.

Much of this Babylonian poem is obscure, and the exact nature of the relation between it and Job uncertain. But one thing is clear: the *form* of the two works is entirely different: the so-called 'Babylonian Job' is not a dialogue; it is the utterance of a single speaker. Thus, even if we were to admit, what is improbable, that what is common to the thought of the Babylonian and Hebrew poems was due to the direct influence of the former over the latter, Babylon would thereby supply no anticipation of the *form* of the Book of Job, which is so little anticipated or paralleled in Hebrew or other early Semitic literature. It is this anticipation or parallelism of form that the new Babylonian fragment in some measure supplies. In it we find dialogue used for the purpose of discussing aspects or problems of life. It has also another formal resemblance to Job, viz. its schematic character. But in both respects the differences are not less striking: in the Babylonian fragment the dialogue is rudimentary, the scheme rigid. In Job the schematism scarcely extends beyond the order of response and the general character of the speeches, which are all of some length and never brief interruptions or explanations; in all three cycles of speeches the friends speak in the same order, Eliphaz first, Bildad second, Šophar third, Job replying to each in turn.² But in the Babylonian dialogue each section is cast in the same mould; and for examples of such schematism we must look elsewhere in Hebrew literature; e.g. to the framework of Judges and Kings, or to the prophetic poem in Am 1. 2; the nearest approach to it in Job, and that a very remote one, is seen in the fact that the speeches of the friends almost uniformly open interrogatively.

The new Babylonian fragment is in form a dialogue, as is the central part of the Book of Job, and it is possible that the lost opening may have formed a remote parallel to the Prologue to Job.

² In the present text the third cycle is incomplete, lacking any speech of Šophar.

But there is nothing in the conclusion which survives that is any way similar either to the speech of Yahweh or to the Epilogue in the Hebrew work. And even the resemblance to the dialogue between Job and his friends is strictly limited; not merely has it but two interlocutors instead of four, but there is much less indication of character. The characters in Job, indeed, are less fully developed and differentiated than in other great dramatic literature, but far more so than the master and the slave in the Babylonian dialogue. Indeed, except perhaps in the last two lines, the two persons of the dialogue are the merest device for presenting two aspects of various forms of human activity.

Thus the main and perhaps the only but yet a sufficient justification for instituting any comparison between the Babylonian and the Hebrew works lies in this, that Job in respect of its form has hitherto occupied a quite isolated position in earlier Semitic literature. The distance between it and this recently discovered Babylonian dialogue is still great; future discoveries¹ may or may not do something to fill up the gap.

¹ Two other Babylonian dialogues have also been published by Ebeling in *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts*: but he found himself unable to carry out his purpose of publishing these with translations in the *Mitteilungen* (see the *Vorwort* to the second heft of the *Mitteilungen*).

Literature.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

THE most important event in the interpretation of the New Testament, since Sir William Ramsay began the issue of his books on St. Paul, is the publication by Messrs. Macmillan of the first volume of a series on *The Beginnings of Christianity*, to be edited by Dr. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Dr. Kirsopp Lake.

'The leading idea of this series is to continue the work begun by the late Bishop Lightfoot in editing Christian documents historically as well as critically. His great contributions of commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, Galatians, Colossians and Philemon, and Philipians, were succeeded by his masterly editions of the Ignatian literature and of Clement of Rome. It is now proposed to follow up these by an edition of the Acts of the Apostles in three volumes, and to extend the series down to the day when the Church obtained official recognition by the Roman Empire.' Part I. (in three volumes) will deal with the Acts of the Apostles, the first volume giving an account of the Jewish, Gentile, and Christian Backgrounds, the second containing the Criticism, and the third the Text and Commentary. The first volume has now been issued (18s. net). It consists of four sections with five appendixes. The first section, on the Jewish World, is divided into four chapters—Chapter I. 'The Background of Jewish History,' by the Editors; Chapter II. 'The Spirit of Judaism,' by

Mr. C. G. Montefiore; Chapter III. 'Varieties of Thought and Practice in Judaism,' and Chapter IV. 'The Dispersion,' both by the Editors. The second section describes the Gentile World. It is divided into two chapters—'The Roman Provincial System,' by Mr. H. T. F. Duckworth, and 'Life in the Roman Empire at the Beginning of the Christian Era,' by Professor Clifford H. Moore. Primitive Christianity is the subject of the last and longest section. It is written entirely by the Editors. Its last chapter is on Christology. The Appendixes are on 'The Zealots,' by the Editors; 'Nazarene and Nazareth,' by Professor George F. Moore; 'The Slavonic Josephus,' by the Editors; 'Differences of Legal Interpretations between Pharisees and Sadducees, by the same; 'The Am ha-ares (the People of the Land) and the Habirim' (Associates), by Professor Moore.

Now it is unnecessary to say that here we have the last word of scholarship. No doubt some of it will be out of date thirty years hence, as some of Lightfoot's work is out of date and erroneous now. But to-day it is all that is known. The only question is, Can the judgment of the editors be relied upon? And that question cannot be answered yet. When the volume on the criticism comes we shall see; we shall see more clearly when we can examine the volume containing the commentary. This volume is a matter of learning, pure and simple.

But notice one fact. Mr. C. G. Montefiore has

been chosen to write the chapter on 'The Spirit of Judaism.' That is the method adopted in THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. Let the believer in the movement tell what the movement is. He can tell it from the inside. He must keep to fact, but let him give his own interpretation of the facts. It is only when we know the best that can be said of man or movement that we know that movement or that man.

THE DEVIL AND SATAN.

Professor H. B. Swete delivered a course of lectures on *The Parables of the Kingdom*. They have now been published, under the care of two of his pupils (Macmillan ; 7s. 6d. net).

It is a long time since we had a strong book on the Parables. And yet no part of Scripture more demands or more repays sure handling. Professor Swete's book is short and authoritative. One might prophesy with little venture that it will become the most popular of all his books.

On the Parable of the Tares he comes to 'the enemy.' The enemy is the Devil, explained our Lord. In an after-note Swete says: 'So many Christians now deny that there is any personal Devil that it is worth while to labour this point a little. First as to the names: *devil* is of course merely one who accuses, maligns; *Satan* is merely an adversary, or, as the parable translates it, an enemy. But the Satan, the Devil, singles out a particular person who is pre-eminently the Adversary, the Accuser; the person who, as St. John says, is commonly called *Devil* and *the Satan*. This person is mentioned only in the later post-exilic books of the Old Testament, and by name only in three passages, Zechariah iii., Job i., and 1 Chronicles xxi.; and the natural inference is that this conception of *the Satan* or personal adversary of God and men—at least under this name—was a somewhat late importation into Jewish theology, possibly as some say of Babylonian or Persian origin. Into that question I need not now go; in any case it was in our Lord's time an article of common belief among the Jews, and was accepted, as it seems, by our Lord in His teaching. The question is whether, this being so, it is binding on Christians, or rather whether it is to be taken as expressing a great and tremendous fact in the spiritual world.

'Now it is clear, I think, that our Lord *did* accept current terms, and even current beliefs, so far as

it was possible to do this consistently with essential truth. It is characteristic of His teaching to start with what people believed, and to use their own expressions and terms so far as He could. You see this in His use of the word *Gehenna*, and *Paradise*, and *Abraham's Bosom*, and perhaps also in much of what He says about demons; for instance, it seems evident that the boy from whom He cast out a demon (Mc ix.) was subject to what we should now call epilepsy; and that when Jesus rebuked the deaf and dumb spirit, He used popular language just as He did when He rebuked the raging winds and sea, as if they had been living things. But His constant acceptance of the principle that a personal evil power presides over all that antagonism to the good will of God which we can plainly see at work is, as it seems to me, far too grave a matter to be treated as a mere concession to popular belief. Even in the case of possession it may be suspected that there is very much more of truth in the current belief than many moderns suppose. But whatever may be thought of the connexion of alien will-power with certain diseases such as epilepsy, there is nothing in science which can disprove the existence of a central personal force of evil such as the New Testament and the teaching of our Lord Himself presuppose. And though I am not prepared to assert that the existence of a personal Devil is an article of the Christian faith, to decry which is heresy in the ecclesiastical sense, I am bound to say that to deny the existence of a personal Devil seems to introduce a grave element of uncertainty into the teaching of Christ and of the Apostles; for of what can we feel sure if on this very fundamental question that teaching is not to be taken seriously?'

THE PRAYER BOOK.

No demand seems to have been more often or more earnestly made by the men in the trenches, when they opened their minds to the padre (if they were of the Church of England), than that there should be a great alteration made in the Prayer Book. And the padre himself, when he had time to record his impression, was as urgent and earnest as the men.

Has anything been done? The Prayer Book is as it was, and no official sanction has been given to an abbreviated or otherwise altered use of it. But tacitly men are encouraged to meet the

strongly felt desire for brevity and intelligibility. If they shorten the service or modernize the language it is understood that they will not be called to account.

But that is not enough. Eight years before the War there arose a public movement for the revision of the Prayer Book. It began with a modification of the Ornaments Rubric. Once begun, the revision went forward. On one part after another there was 'debate, consideration, consultation, and agreement,' until at last it has been found possible to issue an edition of *The Book of Common Prayer* with the main proposals and suggestions incorporated. The edition has been prepared by the Rev. John Neale Dalton, M.A., F.S.A., Canon of Windsor. It is issued from the Cambridge University Press (30s. net).

It is issued without authority. The editor emphasizes that. What is its object? 'If a revised edition of the Book of Common Prayer is ever to become the prayer book of the Church of England, this can only be attained, not by resolution of Convocation or by authority of Parliament, but by the mature judgment that Church people, clerical and lay, have formed upon its merits; yet if that opinion and judgment is to be of real and worthy influence it must be well-informed.' The aim of this edition is to induce a 'thoughtful public opinion on these matters, by simply and frankly shewing what the approximate result would be of the adoption of certain of these Proposals on the text of the present Prayer Book, together with some other rather important additional Suggestions.'

The Psalter required revision most of all. The language has often been altered. But the editor would not have it supposed that he has simply used the Authorized and Revised Versions. 'It will be evident,' he says, 'how often recourse has been had to the earlier Coverdale, and how surprisingly modern are some of his renderings of the rocky terseness of the original. Of the verses that were recommended to be omitted in recitation by Canterbury Convocation, only six in Psalm 69 and fourteen in Psalm 109, one verse only in Psalm 137, and one verse in Psalm 140 have here not been printed. These practically are the only omissions which the Upper House of York Convocation desired. But in Psalm 141, verses six to eight are so corrupt or obscure that they convey now scarcely any real meaning at all, and so have

been omitted. One might perhaps be tempted to do the same with verses twenty-nine to thirty-one in Psalm 68, were it not that the whole of that grand Psalm resembles a Pindaric Ode in its reference to persons and places, semi-obscure to later readers, but no doubt clear in the author's time to his own contemporaries.'

The volume is a triumph of the art of printing.

THE ODES AND PSALMS OF SOLOMON.

A new edition has been published of the Odes of Solomon. It includes the Psalms of Solomon, and is in two volumes. The first volume contains the Text with facsimile reproductions (10s. 6d. net). The second volume contains a Translation with Introduction and Critical as well as Expository Notes (21s. net). The publishers are Messrs. Longmans. The title is *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, re-edited for the Governors of the John Rylands Library by Rendel Harris and Alphonse Mingana.

'The Odes of Solomon (in a Syriac translation, accompanied by the Psalms of Solomon) were discovered by Rendel Harris on Jan. 4, 1909, in a MS. in his collection, which is said by the discoverer to have come from the banks of the Tigris. It was numbered in that collection Cod. Syr. 152, and has now been transferred to the John Rylands Library, where it stands as Cod. Syr. 9. The MS. is a small paper volume, much worn and stained, and has lost, apparently, three leaves at the beginning and perhaps three leaves at the end. In other respects it is complete, very carefully written and legible, forming a volume of 56 leaves preserved from an original volume of 62 leaves. The first and second Odes and the opening of the third Ode stood on the leaves that were lost at the beginning; and the Psalms of Solomon at the other end of the book are defective from Ps 17⁸⁸ to the end. The omissions are to be regretted, especially at the beginning of the book, but they are not serious, and the missing first Ode has been recovered from the *Pistis Sophia*, so that what is really lost in the Odes is the second Ode and some verses at the beginning of the third Ode. The defect at the other end of the book has been met almost completely by the British Museum MS. discovered by Professor Burkitt.'

In the editing of the text, account has been taken of the suggestions of many scholars, but

only the most assured emendations have been incorporated. Others have been discussed in the critical notes to each ode in the second volume. One important change has, however, been made in the text of this edition. 'In working carefully through the text, the editors became convinced that they were dealing with matter that was either Oriental in origin or so coloured by Oriental modes of thought and expression as to be practically Oriental, and they decided that it was necessary to reconstruct, as far as possible, the rhythms which underlay the recovered Syriac text, and which showed remarkable parallelism with early Syriac poetry. The text has accordingly been broken up; and this made it necessary to redistribute and renumber the verses as they were given in Dr. Harris's *editio princeps*: such change in standards of reference is in itself undesirable, but any student who examines the new arrangement of the text will see that it could not very well, in the present case, be avoided.'

The Introduction, which is found in the second volume, is a remarkably acute and lucid product of British scholarship, fit to stand beside any continental work. Note some conclusions:

(1) Time and Place:—'If we are wrong in assigning them as written at Antioch in the first century, we are not far wrong either in place or in time.'

(2) Jewish or Christian?—'We shall assume them to be Christian, for all objections on this side are either superficial and need not be regarded, or they are such as are evanescent as soon as we succeed in getting at the meaning of the author. No one who has spent any time on the study of the book would lay any stress on the fact that the name of Jesus does not appear in its pages, for it is clear that the author has a distinct Christology, not very different from that of the Nicene theology, and employs most of the terms and figures in which the early Christians expressed their doctrine of the Divine nature. His Christ is the Christian's Christ, with an Incarnation in terms more pronounced, in some respects, than the New Testament itself.'

(3) Greek or Syriac?—The balance of the argument is on the side of Greek rather than Syriac as the original.

When we pass to the Notes we are still in the land of lucidity and the interest has increased. It is a strange circumstance that the two clauses in

the Creed which are now most severely criticised, the Virgin Birth and the Descent into Hades, are dealt with in the Odes, the one in the 19th, the other in the 22nd. The Notes on these two Odes are full of curious information—the serpent of Paradise and the Dragon myth, the reason why Moses was told to take hold of the serpent into which his rod was turned by the tail and not by the head (*Christ* being appointed to bruise the *head* of the serpent) and much else.

THE CHANGING EAST.

We are very familiar with the idea of the unchanging East. Professor Edward Caldwell Moore of Harvard is struck with the rapidity and thoroughness of the change that is coming over the East. So in his title *West and East* (Duckworth; 12s. 6d. net) he puts the West first. For the change, seen most vividly in Japan, is due to the adoption of Western civilization. His volume (the Dale Lectures, given at Mansfield College, Oxford, in 1913) is occupied with the causes that have led the East to submit at last and so drastically to change, and with the development of the change in social, political, and religious life.

The causes are of two kinds. 'There has been, in the first place, frank advocacy of western principles of trade and government and, more recently, of secular education. These have been put forth at times by western men as the sole means of creating even the simplest conditions of well-being in the East. For example, in the newly opened parts of Africa, or again in poverty-stricken regions of India and China, there has been an avowed propaganda on behalf of western political and social and economic ideas and a generous sympathy with efforts of orientals to transform their institutions in consonance with these ideas. With enthusiasm men from the West resident in the East have thrown themselves into the work of education in these lands, into philanthropy and reform, into the healing and prevention of disease, into efforts for the mitigation of evils of every sort, and for the amelioration of all conditions of life. This movement has been avowedly secular in its interest. It has often boasted of its contrast with the missionary endeavour. The other motive is moral and religious in its nature. It has aimed primarily at changes in the inner life and religious convictions of men. There has been, mainly

since the last decade of the eighteenth century and practically throughout the non-European world, a wide and zealous propaganda on behalf of the western man's religion. There has been a great enthusiasm for Christian missions.'

Professor Moore believes that these two movements are not antagonistic and ought never to have been suspicious of one another. The secular movement is not 'able to complete its work without advancing towards the area of that which is in principle ethical and religious.'

'The missionary movement also has never been able to complete its work, or even greatly to advance that work, without calling to its aid factors which are not exclusively those of the inner life. The religious spirit must find expression in the outward life of man. There are traits of Christian character which are developed only as men engage in their trades and politics and co-operate in their social organizations and economic endeavours. The highest type of Christian missionary has often been, to an extent of which he was perhaps not aware, the exponent of certain political ideas and educational principles as well.'

These causes are then shown at work throughout the East; but, as already said, most conspicuously in Japan. Politically and economically the change in Japan is thorough enough. The religious change is not so evident. Will Japan become Christian? 'Of the three great religions of Japan, two are foreign to Japan. They came as missionary religions. They must have undergone the process of nationalization and naturalization in Japan, of assimilation of themselves to Japan and of Japan to them. Can they undergo that process once more? It is not that they have again to travel to a world across the sea. The world from across the sea has travelled to them. The result is the same. They have not come again to the need of naturalization. The need of naturalization has come to them. They have only to stand still and do nothing in order to become alien religions in the new Japan, precisely as the paganism which was indigenous to Italy became an alien religion in Italy when the dying old world and the rising new world had asked the questions which Christianity alone could answer. If that happens the strange religion from the far West will be the one which will be at home in the East. It will be naturalized and assimilated and bound by a thousand ties to all the rest of the life of new Japan.'

PROGRESS.

Dr. J. B. Bury, Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge, has written a book on *The Idea of Progress* (Macmillan; 14s. net).

Professor Bury's recent attitude to life is puzzling. He does not say, and he may not think, that it is not worth living, but he makes manifest that he does not think it worth taking seriously. It is not an unusual result of what is called 'free-thinking.' Professor Bury is a rationalist. His whole soul is given to the consideration of things that are present and seen. And the issue is disappointment.

This book is an inquiry into the origin and growth of the idea of progress. But Professor Bury is not interested in the idea of progress. Other people are interested in it, and he traces the history of their interest. But he does not share it. For what is progress? It is scientific discovery, the increase of knowledge and of the means of luxurious living. Professor Bury is not concerned about scientific progress. He does not believe in the increase of knowledge. It might be all right if, as knowledge grows from more to more, reverence dwelt more within us. But as it is, he is of the mind of Koheleth, that he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow.

What, then, is progress? What else is it? If it were increase of the knowledge of God, if it were the recognition of the Spirit dwelling among us and leading us into all the truth—that would be something to believe in, something worth believing in. But Professor Bury does not believe in that.

And so the book ends in an anti-climax of almost incredible emptiness. It ends with these two queries: 'Does not Progress itself suggest that its value as a doctrine is only relative, corresponding to a certain not very advanced stage of civilisation; just as Providence, in its day, was an idea of relative value, corresponding to a stage somewhat less advanced? Or will it be said that this argument is merely a disconcerting trick of dialectic played under cover of the darkness in which the issue of the future is safely hidden by Horace's prudent god?'

What is the difference between training and education? Mr. George Willis says it is a difference of speech. A boy who has had a Public

School training is educated, 'however stubbornly he has resisted the educational influences to which he has been subjected,' simply because he has been taught a little Latin; the boy who has been educated at a national school is only trained, 'no matter what aptitude and diligence he has shown in his schooldays,' simply because he has learned no Latin. It is a matter of speech. The one can speak well, the other cannot. 'An uneducated person is known by his speech, or rather by his want of speech, by the narrowness of his range of expression and apprehension. The reason of this deficiency is not hard to discover. Two-thirds of English words are borrowed from the Latin. Therefore in order to understand the English language of to-day, it is necessary to have some knowledge of the elements of Latin.'

Mr. Willis has written a book on *The Philosophy of Speech* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). It is original; it is readable; it has the making of speakers in it, if speakers can be made.

Dr. Rudolph Steiner's *The Threefold State* has been translated into English (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). It is an attempt to solve the social problem. As in the body there are three systems, that of the nerves and senses, that of the circulation of the blood, and that of the digestion; so in the social world there are three systems, the economic, the political, and the spiritual or individual. And it is by giving each of these parts of social life its proper place and co-ordinating them that the social problem is solved. The three branches of the body social 'must not be artificially centralized into some abstract theoretical kind of unity in a parliament or otherwise. They must become three actual, living members of the social body, each centred in itself, working alongside one another and in co-operation.' The three elements correspond to the three watchwords of the French Revolution—Fraternity, Equality, Liberty.

John Handyside, a brilliant student in philosophy at the University of Edinburgh, and subsequently Lecturer in Philosophy in the University of Liverpool, was killed in the war on October 18th, 1916. Professor Pringle Pattison has discovered three essays which he had written; and, with a biographical preface, he has edited and published them. *The Historical Method in Ethics, and other Essays*, is the title (Constable;

5s. net). The essay which gives the volume its title is the longest and most mature—a fine exposition of that method as applied to Ethics which we now apply so successfully to Theology. The others are on 'The Absolute and "Intellect"' and 'System and Mechanism.' In the last there is an acute discussion of teleology.

Few events of a literary kind will give more pleasure to scholars than the resumption after the War of the Oxford edition of *The Works of Aristotle translated into English*. The new part contains the *Oeconomica* and the *Atheniensium Respublica* (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; 5s. net). The *Oeconomica* is translated by Mr. E. S. Forster, M.A., Lecturer in Greek in the University of Sheffield, the *Respublica* by Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, K.C.B., F.B.A. Both are scholars' translations, the original being expressed in English as accurately as possible and less consideration being given to the flow of language. Both again have footnotes and a brief introduction. When the whole edition is translated the parts as issued will be arranged in eleven volumes, for which binding cases will be supplied by the publishers. The general editor, it will be remembered, is Mr. W. D. Ross, Fellow of Oriel College.

The demand most urgently addressed to the preacher at present is to make Christianity real, and that usually means moral and social. There is great impatience with 'theology.' But what is theology? In this demand it is the New Birth. And the Rev. Hunter Smith, for one, is very sure that without regeneration morality, whether social or individual, is impossible. His book is all about the social aspect of religion—the religious aspect of competition, Capital and Labour, Work and Wages, Riches, Politics, and the like. Hence the title *The Economics of the Kingdom of God* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). But before the book is ended you read this:

'We have recently had the most startling evidence of the complete ignorance, or gross misunderstanding of the truths and facts of Christianity displayed by the vast majority of the people. Various have been the reasons given for such a tragic state of things, and various the remedies suggested. They are all more or less plausible and urgent. But in all the inquiries and discussions that have followed, one inexorable fact

seems to have been forgotten, or, at least, lightly regarded. It is emphatically stated by St. Paul: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Here is the fundamental problem that confronts all who are distressed by the decay of religion among all classes, and are agonising for its revival. It is a problem that meets us directly in those amazing but incontestable statements that the great mass of our young men, as encountered in the army, simply do not know what Christianity means, and regard the teaching and testimony of the churches as unintelligible and remote from real life. It is admitted that they have nearly all been baptised, that is, they have had some sort of family connection with the Church—and have nearly all been religiously instructed in their childhood. The teaching may have been defective—though that is still a matter to be determined—but so much is clear, that whatever they may have learned they have forgotten or ignored, and whatever they hear they misconstrue. St. Paul found the same thing in his own generation, and so did Isaiah in his. The Christian Apostle quotes the words of the Hebrew Prophet to describe his own experience. Christ Himself makes the same reference when He would indicate the results of His own ministry. "By hearing ye shall hear and not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive." There are an incapacity and a resistance in human nature which baffle the most earnest and clearest efforts to state the truth. Jesus put the problem in its plainest form when He said: "Except a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God." In fact, the natural man must be radically and entirely changed before we can look for any understanding or response from him.

Messrs. Longmans have issued a cheap edition of Professor W. H. Griffith Thomas's well-known manual of evangelical theology, *The Catholic Faith* (1s. 6d. net).

A Memoir of *Father Maturin* has been written by Maisie Ward (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net). The memoir is short. The greater part of the volume is occupied with selections from Father Maturin's letters. The letters are in a very large proportion occupied with the question of passing from the

Anglican to the Roman Church. The Rev. W. B. Maturin 'went over' himself, and naturally was much consulted by those who 'trembled on the brink.' His advice was always the same: If you are sure you should go, go; if you are not sure, don't. Nearly everybody who consulted him went. Of only one is it said, 'she had not gone when the correspondence ended.'

We do not know that the case *against* the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles has ever been put more convincingly (though quite popularly) than by the Rev. Alexander Nairne, D.D., Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, in his book entitled *The Faith of the New Testament* (Longmans; 6s. net). The book contains the Hulsean Lectures of 1919-1920. Its title is accurate. What we find in it is the Gospel of the first followers as nearly as we can now come to it. And we further find that it is the Gospel for us.

After speaking of the lack of external testimony to the Pastorals, and contrasting the organization of the Church therein with that underlying the accepted Epistles of St. Paul, Dr. Nairne says:

'There is, however, one true difficulty which does still daunt the student, and the more he is an enthusiastic and reverent admirer of S. Paul the more it daunts him. It is that in the Pastorals the essential mind of S. Paul is generally absent. We shall see more distinctly as we go on what that mind is. For the present let us merely quote Gal. ii. 20, "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me." This deep, personal, intellectual, and moral passion informs all the other epistles. There is hardly a trace of it in the regulations, advice, and warning which fill the pages of the Pastorals. And this cannot be accounted for by their "pastoral" character. There are plenty of directions, rules, and admonitions in the other epistles. But there all starts from and runs out into this very marked theology; all this (to repeat the word) "informed" by it. In the Pastorals it is not so. Those who have learned the terms from Dr. Bigg would say that the "mystic" has turned "disciplinarian." That would, of course, be no disparagement of the Pastorals: Dr. Bigg took the noble first epistle of S. Peter as the type of disciplinarian theology.

But it is a question whether such a change would befall so uncommon, so complete, and so deeply moulded a character as S. Paul's. And there is a further embarrassment. This Pauline mind does not run through the Pastorals with lessened or diverted intensity. For whole paragraphs it is not there at all. But now and again it appears, contrasting with the context. The passage in 2 Timothy (iv. 6 ff.) already quoted is an instance; and again and again in this epistle especially we seem to catch and lose again the well-known accent.'

The Armenian Question is admirably handled by M. Pierre Crabitès in an Introduction to the English translation of *Armenia and the Armenians*, by Mr. Kevork Aslan (Macmillan; \$1.25). It is handled with full knowledge and fine temper. Such a presentation of the Armenian case before the Peace Conference should be (and by the time this is published probably has been) as successful in securing a good settlement for Armenia as Venezelos has succeeded in obtaining for Greece. The book, written originally in French by an Armenian, is a history of the Armenians from the earliest times to the latest, a valuable history of a wonderful race. Frederick the Great's chaplain pointed to the preservation of the Jews as the great evidence for Providence; the preservation of the Armenians is yet more providential.

Dr. Roland G. Usher, Professor of History in Washington University, St. Louis, has written *The Story of the Great War* within the compass of a single volume, and has found room for a large number of maps and illustrations (Macmillan; \$2.50). It is a handy square volume of just three hundred and fifty pages. This Professor of History has the gift of condensation, and with it the gift of lucidity. He gives us the pleasure of seeing both the wood and the trees, for he loves to sketch a great broad movement and again he loves to describe a single great act. He has even had space left for the introduction of causes and consequences. For instance: 'One of the reasons why the Germans began the war was the belief that the British Empire was so weak and disloyal that it could not resist assault. One of the reasons why the Germans were defeated in the war was the loyalty and strength of the British Empire. The Germans were sure that the war would create a

new Empire surpassing in extent and power any of the old Empires. They were right; the war has created a new British Empire, stronger, more unified than ever before, a real state whose importance in times to come will be incalculable.'

The Divinity of Man (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net) is not an inviting title. It has unholy associations. The unbeliever in the Divinity of Christ does not now deny it; he affirms the Divinity of Man. Mr. Reginald Wells is not an unbeliever in the Divinity of Christ. In a Postscript to this book he sets forth the articles of his creed, and one of them is that 'he believes the Lord Jesus to be God.' That is more than any Unitarian would say. But in the same article he says that 'he also believes the divinity of all men to differ from that of the Lord in degree and not, as seems to be the opinion of most clergymen, in kind,' and that takes all value away from the assertion of the Divinity of Christ.

The purpose of the book is to encourage men to believe that they have their salvation in their own hands. No outside person or influence should be allowed to interfere. 'Men are God, and the only plea that they allow themselves to hear is the appeal to their divinity. Any master knows that a boy will respond to an appeal to his honour, when all other appeal is vain. And this is true of men. Not all the pains of hell or earth shall frighten a man from fornication. He may restrain his bodily desires when he hears God whispering within himself, and when he sees God looking at him through the eyes of the partner of his shame.'

If it is not a foolish it is certainly a futile position. Experience, plentiful and bitter, has proved its futility. Does this young chaplain imagine that men would have believed, and gone on believing, in an entrance into this world of the Son of God and His death of Atonement on the Cross, if they could have found salvation by looking into the eyes of their partners in sin? He says many true things, and he says them in a fresh original way, a way that gives them adhesiveness, but his purpose in publishing is not worth achieving and never will be achieved.

'The Christian Association of the University of Pennsylvania recently started a campaign to induce at least two thousand students to read during the Lenten period the life and sayings of Jesus as

presented in their simplest form by the book of Mark. The first announcement of the course read:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{"Christianity} &= x + y \\ y &= \text{'isms'}\end{aligned}$$

This is an equation, not an identity."

After this statement of the equation had been posted long enough to arouse some curiosity in the student body, the second announcement, which was explanatory of the first, was made. It read as follows:

"Has Christianity failed?
Or only its 'isms'?
What did Jesus teach?"

"Those who pledged themselves to undertake this course were organized into seventy-two discussion groups. These groups arranged to meet once a week under the direction of a leader at fraternity houses, dormitories, classrooms, and the committee rooms of the Houston (Student's) Club. The leaders were enlisted from the faculty men, Christian Association secretaries, older students, and extramural friends of the University, and the conduct of a normal class for training the leaders was assigned to me as the representative of our School of Education."

The 'me' is Professor Frank Pierrepont Graves, Ph.D. The book which Professor Graves has written, and which he has called *What did Jesus Teach?* (Macmillan, \$1.75), contains the course of lectures which he gave to that normal class. Here is the summary of them: What did Jesus teach? 'Jesus described God as "father," with the attributes of protecting care, pity, and forgiveness, and held that men became the sons of God by adopting these characteristics. On the social side, he regarded God as "king," and made humility, purity, and service the test of membership in his Kingdom. These ideals, then, lead to a process of reconstructing one's life known as "conversion," and the state attained thereby is called "salvation." In his teaching concerning the hereafter, according to John, Jesus asserted a present resurrection, as well as a future. The same evangelist represents him as teaching that judgments are constantly being made, but culminate in final judgments; and that reward and punishment will not consummate with death. For the solution of social problems—divorce, the family, diversions, wealth, almsgiving, industrial conditions, and politics, Jesus has

furnished principles and not definite rules. And his utterances upon any problem were illustrative of these principles, and, growing out of the occasion, often seem contradictory, unless they are examined together.'

It is a clever convincing summary. But Professor Graves must be rebuked for one almost incredible blunder. He speaks of 'rendering the prostitute Magdalene a virtuous disciple.'

In *A Unitarian's Thought of God* (Lindsey Press; 2s. 6d. net) you will find as clear and conscientious an account of what Christianity is without Christ as you will find anywhere. It is Christianity. For though the Rev. Christopher J. Street, M.A., LL.B., is a theist, he cannot escape from his Christian surroundings. The theism he believes in he finds in the Gospels. But it is Christianity without Christ. For it is without that 'power of God unto salvation' which comes from faith in 'Him who loved us and gave Himself for us.'

China is a large country and needs a large book to describe it. Bishop James W. Bashford's *China: An Interpretation* (Abingdon Press; \$3.50 net) runs now, in its third edition, to 668 pages. His idea was to give such an estimate of China as Viscount Bryce gave of the United States, Lafcadio Hearn of Japan, and President Lowell of England—a better estimate every one (so he says) than any native has ever given.

The book was published in 1916. Within three months it had to be issued in a second edition, to which the author added a long chapter on Yuan Shih Kai, the ambitious politician who was made Emperor in December 1915, but had to descend from the throne within six months and dissolve the Empire. Then Bishop Bashford died. His secretaries, James H. Lewis and J. P. MacMillan, have brought out the third edition. They have added another long chapter, dealing with the Origin and Qualities of the Chinese, and bringing the history of China up to date.

'My message would be salvation by faith in an atoning Saviour and risen Lord, and no sneers of "the enlightened" or clamour of "the liberals" would cause me to change it one iota. A great deal of the talk about the new age needing a new message is arrant nonsense. Down at bottom the "new age" will be just like all other ages, made up of

sinful men and women who need a Saviour, and no substitution of a "Christ ideal" for the historical Jesus can meet that need. Neither Hellenistic naturalism nor a creedless church, made up of those who believe anything or nothing, can save the world. "Christ crucified is unto the Greeks foolishness," now as in the day of Saint Paul, but unto them which are called, in every age, he is "the power of God and the wisdom of God."

These are brave words, but there is no bravado in them. They are truth and they are life. For they are not the words of Andrew Gillies only, but also of the Christ Himself and His apostles. In that temper and with that clearness of faith Mr. Gillies writes all the essays contained in *The Individualistic Gospel* (Methodist Book Concern; \$1.25 net).

In short pithy chapters, some of them almost sensational, all of them arresting, the Rev. Fred. A. Rees discourses to young men on *Honour and Heroism* (R.T.S.; 3s. net).

To have a Gospel is one thing, to bestow it is another. The Rev. J. S. M. Hooper, M.A., in *The Approach to the Gospel* (S.C.M.; 1s. net) warns us in offering the Gospel to others (1) not to put premature emphasis on theology; or (2) on the Divinity of Christ; or (3) on aspects not emphasized by Jesus. In the last warning he refers to God's omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience. Then he introduces us directly to the Christ of the Gospels; for the Gospel is in the Gospels and the Gospel is Christ.

'Thoughtful men and women in our day are concerned as men have seldom been before to get at reality in religion.' That is the first sentence in Mr. Henry Kingman's *Building on Rock*, a study in Character-Building under the Master Builder (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). And it is reality that is searched for throughout the book. It is reality in Faith, Service, Prayer, Fellowship, and all the rest of the great Christian energies. The book is most invigorating. This is one of the illustrations used in it: 'In the common room of Magdalene College, Cambridge, two portraits hang on the wall, facing each other across the table, portraits of two men who shared the zest of life to the fullest and who fought hard for life's prizes. One is of Pepys—sleek, satisfied, kindly, sensuous; a man who

cheerfully tried to skim the cream off life's surface for himself and measurably succeeded. The other is of Charles Kingsley, who also delighted in life beyond most men, but whose heart burned like a flame in sympathy with the wrongs and sorrows of the poor, and who gave himself, like his Master, in generous devotion to all who needed him. And his face, lined with love and pain, is of one who looked ineffably far beyond the getting and spending of life's pleasures. It is not so much that one man had a different philosophy from the other, though this was true, as that one man lived in the closest contact with the spirit of Jesus and the other instinctively avoided any contact with Him more intimate than that of formal religion. But the world to-day, in its present mood, recognizes in good-natured Pepys the despair of society, and in Charles Kingsley, with all his limitations, the power that can lift it out of its despair.'

In his exposition of the parable of *The Prodigal Son* (Scott; 2s. net) the Rev. Claude Dunbar Paterson disregards the elder brother, though it was on his account, and to him, that the parable was spoken. He misses the meaning still further, and that of all the parables, by discovering a spiritual reference in every detail. Thus he says that six gifts were bestowed on the prodigal when he returned—the kiss, the robe, the ring, the shoes, the feast, the merriment; and these six have as their spiritual counterparts pardon, purity, position, power, plenty, pleasures.

An unpretentious but singularly informing book on Japan has been published by the Central Board of Missions and the S.P.C.K., with the title of *New Life in the Oldest Empire* (6s. net). The author, Mr. Charles F. Sweet, gives us provokingly little information about himself; but it is evident that he has eyes to see and has seen. He is not impressed with the sincerity of the Japanese rulers, he fears their ambition and its unscrupulous methods; but he loves the people. His earnest desire is that we should throw all the resources at our disposal into the task of making Japan Christian—for Japan's sake, for the sake of China, and for the sake of the civilization of the world.

Four volumes have been added to the S.P.C.K. 'Texts for Students': (1) *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (4d. net) and (2) *The Epistle of Barnabas*

(6d. net), both edited by the Rev. T. W. Crafer, D.D.; (3) *The Code of Hammurabi* (in an English translation), by Percy Handcock, M.A. (1s. net); (4) *Select Passages illustrating Commercial and Diplomatic Relations between England and Russia*, by A. Weiner, M.A., F.R.Hist.S. (1s. 6d. net).

Note also the issue of two more volumes of the 'Helps for Students of History': *Introduction to the Study of Russian History*, by W. F. Reddaway (8d. net), and *A Guide to the History of Education*, by Professor J. W. Adamson (8d. net).

One of the discoveries of early Church literature made in our day is a work of Irenaeus called the *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*. It was found in an Armenian translation, and is quite unknown otherwise beyond a few quotations from the original Greek in early writers. The manuscript containing it was discovered 'in December 1904, in the Church of the Blessed Virgin at Eriwan in Armenia, by Dr. Karapet Ter-Mekerttshian, one of the most learned of the Armenian clergy. It was edited by him with a translation into German, in conjunction with Dr. Edward Ter-Minassiantz, in 1907, in the *Texte und Untersuchungen* (xxxi. 1); and Dr. Harnack added a brief dissertation and some notes. Then in 1912 Dr. Simon Weber, of the Faculty of Catholic Theology in the University of Freiburg in Breisgau, being dissatisfied with this presentation of the work, published a fresh translation with the help of some Armenian scholars. Neither of these translations satisfies the needs of English patristic students. The second, though it corrects some errors of the first, is far less close to the original text. And both are vitiated by a want of acquaintance with the textual criticism of the Septuagint and the Greek New Testament, and also with the larger work of St. Irenaeus himself.' Accordingly the Dean of Wells, Dr. J. Armitage Robinson, has translated the Armenian text into English. The title is *St. Irenaeus: The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net).

In the Introduction Dr. Robinson discusses the Debt of Irenaeus to Justin Martyr, and the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Justin and Irenaeus.

For the *Bibliotheca* of Photius we have hitherto

had to go to Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, with its translation into Latin by the Jesuit Andreas Schott. Now at last, through the enterprise of the S.P.C.K., we are to enjoy the easy reading of a modern English translation. Mr. J. H. Freese is to be the translator. The whole work will run to six volumes with the title of *The Library of Photius*. Five volumes will be required for the translation, the sixth being given to a Biography, Bibliography, and General Index. The first volume is out, in the attractive form of the S.P.C.K. translations of Christian Literature (10s. net).

The translation is a delight to read—accurate without pedantry, free without looseness. Take a single paragraph:

'In the river Indus a worm is found resembling those which are usually found on fig-trees. Its average length is seven cubits, though some are longer, others shorter. It is so thick that a child ten years old could hardly put his arms round it. It has two teeth, one in the upper and one in the lower jaw. Everything it seizes with these teeth it devours. By day it remains in the mud of the river, but at night it comes out, seizes whatever it comes across, whether ox or camel, drags it into the river, and devours it all except the intestines. It is caught with a large hook baited with a lamb or kid attached by iron chains. After it has been caught, it is hung up for thirty days with vessels placed underneath, into which as much oil from the body drips as would fill ten Attic *kotylae*. At the end of the thirty days, the worm is thrown away, the vessels of oil are sealed and taken as a present to the king of India, who alone is allowed to use it. This oil sets everything alight—wood or animals—over which it is poured, and the flame can only be extinguished by throwing a quantity of thick mud on it.'

The verbatim report of *A Public Debate on 'The Truth of Spiritualism'* between Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and Joseph McCabe has been published by Messrs. Watts (1s. net). It is not quite so futile as public debates usually are. It brings out glaringly the ignorance and indifference to truth of Sir Conan Doyle. Mr. McCabe evidently knows the subject a great deal better than this popular exponent of it.

The Holy Spirit and Christ.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN A. HUTTON, D.D., GLASGOW.

IT will be a wise thing for us, for it will always safeguard religious life, defending it from the perils of mere ecstasy, to associate the work of the Holy Spirit directly with the influence of Jesus. There are those who indeed will identify these two. One of our foremost theologians, who only recently passed away, gave it as his own mature and considered opinion that the Holy Spirit of the New Testament is to be conceived simply as the supernatural impression and effluence of Jesus. For myself I do not take that position, although, to be perfectly frank, my mind is not one that quarrels with any one who takes such a position; and I welcome any statement which binds the work of the Holy Spirit to the real personality of Jesus Christ.

St. Paul, dealing, as I imagine he was, with controversies in the Corinthian Church, gave this ruling:

‘For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,) yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.’

That is to say, men in his day were on one side and another talking of ‘God,’ each claiming to have the support of God. And what St. Paul in effect says is: ‘The word God by itself is indecisive; it is like the algebraic “x”; it is the unknown. Any one can quote “God” as on his side, that is to say, the absolute.’ ‘And now,’ he continues in effect, ‘let us all understand that when a man in our community speaks of God, he means the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Such a man, therefore, when he claims the support of God for any position which he takes up or for any practice which he follows, must be able to show that that position which he takes up and that that practice which he follows are in harmony with the explicit guidance of Jesus Christ.’ That is to say, Christ is the norm and the safeguard for all our thoughts about God; and so, I often say, the real question to-day is not, so to speak, the deity of Christ; it is the Christlikeness of God.

Now I think that point of view is of some

assistance to us and helps us to see the wisdom, to say no more, which led the early Church to its doctrine of the Holy Ghost. It is an easy and cheap thing for enlightened men out in the world to scoff at some of those ancient formularies of the undivided Church, and to dismiss ancient controversies such as the ‘Homocousion’ and the ‘Filioque’ as idle logomachies; and yet when we approach these controversies with sympathy, we see that they were by no means idle. After all, the ancient world was rent in twain from Rome to Scythia over the question of the ‘Homocousion’; and the whole religious world might one day be rent in twain over the doctrine of the ‘Filioque.’

Our Creed declares that the Holy Ghost proceeds ‘from the Father and the Son.’ The phrase ‘and the Son’ I hold to be a safeguard so momentous that I believe it had the imprimatur of God.

Amending St. Paul’s ruling in that Corinthian controversy in which he laid it down as a principle that *the heart of God is Christ*, and that when we of the Church speak of God we are to be understood as meaning the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, we want to say to-day that the heart of the Holy Ghost is Christ, and that any one who speaks about the Holy Spirit, about having the Holy Spirit, about manifesting the Holy Spirit, must be understood as meaning a Spirit which is in perfect harmony with the mind and character of the Lord Jesus Christ. There are many spirits, as an Apostle once put it, and we are to try them to see what is their essential nature.

I recall, from the lips of one of the most devout as he was one of the ablest ministers of our Church, now at rest with God, the story of an incident at the time of the Irish Revival in 1859, where, in the midst of a genuine outpouring of spiritual power, there were many make-believes and imitations. In a room in Belfast a woman was exhibited who was declared to be in a trance under the influence of the Holy Ghost. In a shaded room—we shall be wise always to suspect a religious influence which requires manipulated lights—she lay and upon her breast appeared

letters in fire, letters forming the word 'Jesus.' But, as he told me from whom I had the incident, which happened under his own eyes, and he himself, I repeat, was one of God's great saints, the word 'Jesus' was spelt wrongly: '*Jee*sus.' This was enough for my old friend, who there and

then denounced the whole business, remarking that the Holy Ghost could surely spell the Name of Jesus correctly.

Now that is not only truth and fact: it is a parable. The sign of the Holy Ghost is that we spell 'Jesus' with ease and accuracy.

The Upsurge of Barbarism.

BY THE REVEREND W. D. NIVEN, M.A., ABERDEEN.

ONE is becoming rather tired of hearing and of saying—we have all said, it—that the portentous unrest of our times with all its manifold variety is due to the late War. We are beginning to recollect that there was considerable evidence of most of the strange features of to-day before the War began. It is interesting to raise the question as to whether one cannot guess at some fact which might explain many at least of the characteristics of our present state, and account likewise for what was most unexpected and most appalling in the War itself.

I would suggest the idea that civilization has been for some time, and still is, suffering from an upsurge of barbarism. The barbarism of the War is only one part of the phenomenon; and, while it may have intensified other aspects of it, did not originate them.

Take what at first hearing may sound a ludicrous example, but on consideration may appear not without significance,—the matter of women's dress. In wealthy, 'smart' circles we find what is no doubt an unconscious, but none the less real, reversion towards barbaric fashion.

Take painting. It may be presumptuous for one whose art-education is of the slenderest to speak, but in such movements as Cubism there appears to the lay eye something reminiscent of barbaric ideas of representation. In music, Mr. Dooly's account of the modern orchestra as including buzz-saws and lawn-mowers is an exaggeration, but only an exaggeration of an undoubted tendency of an undoubtedly barbaric order.

In some modern poetry, with its proud defiance of all 'civilized' canons of versification and scansion, and in some of the new dances, we see the same tendency.

Take sexual morality. The War with its heavy emotional strain no doubt did much to cause an upset, but barbaric ideas on the subject were increasingly prevalent before its outbreak. In this field, indeed, civilization never has won a very decisive victory over the 'primitive,' and in recent times the 'primitive' have justified themselves on frankly primitive grounds, while we have also to note the place won for itself in American jurisprudence by the barbaric plea of an 'unwritten law,' which makes killing for infidelity no punishable offence. It is a fact of extraordinary interest that the recrudescence of barbaric morality, or from our view-point immorality, should be accompanied by a re-appearance of barbaric justice. Take our industrial unrest. It may be said that it is largely due to, or expressive of, the adoption of the good old barbaric principle:

They should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can.

Take Religion. Our day is marked by the strong recrudescence of certain elements highly characteristic of barbarian or savage thought, or the thought of the remote past. Theosophy makes us 'versed in Vedic lore.' Spiritualists of a certain order are finding joy unspeakable in reconstructing their psychic environment to the pattern of that of our far back barbarian ancestors. Sir A. Conan Doyle seriously suggests that in criminal inquiries the Police should be given the assistance of a 'medium'—a dignitary who in savage days was detective, chief witness, and counsel.

I do not mention many minor witnesses to the barbaric movement, the (pre-war) Druids of Paris may be named as a specimen. What has been said may suffice as a basis for my idea that we are passing through a time when by some means or

other Barbarism has re-appeared to challenge civilization on its most vital points.

If that be so, some interesting questions arise. How are we to conceive of this phenomenon? I speak of the *upsurge* of barbarism. It would, I think, be to misinterpret the facts to speak of a *return* to barbarism. With the exception of the Prussian mind as directed to warfare, I do not believe that the human mind has deliberately determined on an adoption of barbaric ideas or ideals. At least the vast majority of those who exemplify the renaissance of barbarism would be shocked at the mere idea that they were 'reverting.' Their idea is that they are exponents of the new, not of the age-old. One will be met with only amusement or scorn if one tells an ardent disciple of the 'newest' in religion that his view was hoary with age at the dawn of history. No, save in quite exceptional and pathological cases, there has been no deliberate or conscious return to barbarism. We must look at it in this way. The race has been civilized for a very short time compared with the very long ages of preceding savagery and barbarism. Just as the old habits of a converted and civilized savage or heathen individual will from time to time struggle to the surface, just as the habits of youth will sometimes re-assert themselves in a soberer middle-age, so the old habits of thought and morals of the race may seek for expression long after the race as a whole has grown out of them. Old habits may find expression when the mental and moral energies of the individual are somewhat 'run down,' and it is very conceivable that the pressure of life at the end of the nineteenth and the opening of the twentieth centuries produced this racial mental and moral fatigue which afforded an opening for the upsurge of old racial habits.

Once again, Psychology is beginning tentatively and cautiously, as is fitting, to recognize the existence, and tremendous possibilities if it does exist, of the subliminal or subconscious mind in the individual. According to the theory this subconscious mind forgets nothing. It keeps the whole of the past experience of the individual carefully in store. By laws which we cannot yet guess at, this subconscious mind sometimes interferes with or displaces the ordinary consciousness,

in certain persons at least, if not in all. If we think of the race as an individual, then in the racial mind civilization represents the normal consciousness, but beneath this, and liable under certain circumstances to interfere with and displace it, lies all the race's long experience of barbarism. Thus the abnormality of racial mentality and morality appears no more difficult to explain than temporary abnormality in the individual, nor need it, if we take long views, fill us with more alarm.

But what about the Providential government of the world? What of the teleological aspect of this upsurge?

If we look back to the experience of the race, we find that civilization has repeatedly run a certain course and become effete and lifeless, only, however, to be replaced after a longer or shorter period of conflict and confusion by a civilization of a higher type. The agency by which this two-sided work of destruction and reconstruction was accomplished was very frequently a barbarian invasion. Why it should be so, it is in vain to ask. Sufficient for us to recognize that it has been so. That our civilization was tending to effeteness, that its great energies seemed to be 'running down,' was a familiar observation in the years preceding the War. The world was in such a condition that invasion of civilization by any barbarian race was unthinkable. But the old method of sweeping out and restoring was still available. There was barbarism underlying civilization everywhere. As I have tried to show, it was oozing upwards at many points. It found its main and striking vent in the War. No invasion by barbarian tribes could have dealt a heavier blow at civilization than the civilized race inflicted on itself. And we who believe in Providence and know something of what barbarian invasion meant for decadent civilization in the past, will look to the future of the race with hopefulness. The end of conflict is not yet, we cannot tell how long it may last. But we may be confident that 'the old order changeth, yielding place to new'; that the new will be better than the old, and that barbarism will once more prove to be, as it has often been before, the unwitting servant of human welfare.

In the Study.

Eli.

'Because his sons made themselves vile, and he restrained them not.'—1 S 3¹³.

ELI the high priest of Israel was descended from Ithamar the younger of the sons of Aaron. How the younger line of Ithamar came to be substituted for the elder line of Eleazar, we do not know. Eli would seem to have succeeded Abishua, of the older line of Eleazar; and there must have been some occurrence, involving failure on the part of Eleazar's descendants, and special favour towards the descendants of Ithamar, to account for an arrangement which violated the hereditary law that governed the transmission of the priesthood.

In the person of Eli were united for the first time in the history of Israel the two offices of high priest and judge. He is stated to have judged Israel forty years (1 S 4¹⁸). Great things seem to have been expected of him, for if ever the office had a chance of fitting itself to the Theocracy and becoming the permanent form by which the Theocracy was to be worked, it was now when the civil and ecclesiastical power met in one man, and when personal merit and hereditary standing seemed to be combined in a single person. Eli is an interesting study, if only as an example of how a really good man may prove a failure.

I.

A TWO-SIDED CHARACTER.

Eli had a good side and a bad side.

1. Look at his good side first. There was an entire absence of envy in him. He furthered Samuel's advancement and assisted it to his own detriment. Eli was the one in Israel to whom, naturally, a revelation should have come. God's priest and God's judge, to whom so fitly as to him could God send a message? But another's preferred: the inspiration comes to Samuel, and Eli is superseded and disgraced. Besides this, every conceivable circumstance of bitterness is added to his humiliation—God's message for all Israel comes to a boy: to one who had been Eli's pupil, to one beneath him, who had performed servile offices for him. This was the bitter cup put into his hand to drink. And Eli himself assisted Samuel to attain this dignity. He it was

who perceived 'that God had called the child.' He did not say in petulance—'Then, let this favoured child find out for himself all he has to do, I will leave him to himself.' Eli meekly told him to go back to his place, instructed him how he was to accept the revelation, and appropriate it: 'Go, lie down: and it shall be, if he call thee, that thou shalt say, Speak, Lord; for thy servant heareth.' He conducted his rival to the presence chamber which by himself he could not find, and left him there with the King, to be invested with the order which has been stripped off himself.

It is a proverb, 'Humility comes through humiliations.' To make an act of humility might cost nothing. Mortifications from others do cost.¹

(1) Eli's perception that it was God who spoke to Samuel must have had a pang in it. It is not easy for the old to recognize that the young hear God's voice more clearly than they, or for the superior to be glad when he is passed over and new truth dawns on the inferior. But, if there was any such feeling, it is silenced with beautiful self-abnegation, and he tells the wondering child the meaning of the voice and the answer he must make.

It may be that Eli had not forgotten the little injustice he had inadvertently done to Hannah, when he mistook her unwonted fervency in prayer for a sign of intoxication. How promptly and eagerly he accepted her explanation, and hastened to relieve her wounded spirit: 'No, my lord, I am a woman of a sorrowful spirit; I have drunk neither wine nor strong drink, but have poured out my soul before the Lord.' 'Then Eli answered and said, Go in peace; and the God of Israel grant thee thy petition that thou hast asked of him. And she said, Let thine handmaid find grace in thy sight. So the woman went her way, and did eat, and her countenance was no more sad.' Thus he turned her weeping into joy.

(2) Eli resolved to know the whole truth. He would not have Samuel leave out anything, out of regard to his feelings. He must know the whole, however painful it may be. He has learned to reverence God's truth, and cannot bear the idea of not knowing all. And Samuel, who did not wish to tell him anything, is now constrained to tell

¹ *Spiritual Letters of Edward Bowyer Pusey*, 316.

him the whole. He 'told him every whit, and hid nothing from him.' He did not shun to declare to him the whole counsel of God.

(3) He was resigned to the will of God. Looking at this aspect of Eli's character, we feel a reverence for the old man. When he was told that his house would be rooted up, that both his sons should die on one day, that the judgment of the Lord had set in against him and his successors, what did he say? He was nearly a hundred years old; his eyes were dim; for forty years he had maintained a position of supremacy. Men cannot easily throw away the traditions and the social consequence of so long-continued an elevation. Yet when the old man heard his doom, he said, 'It is the Lord: let him do what seemeth him good.' How many of us could have shown the same submissiveness, the same religious homage; under circumstances so terrible? An earthquake shaking the foundations of your house—a storm-cloud pouring out its flood upon your inheritance! Yet Eli was no vengeful priest in that hour; he was no mere self-seeker in that terrible day. Even then, when the foundations were rocking under his feet, and all the surroundings of his life were full of tempestuous and devouring elements, he said, with an old man's tremulous pathos, 'It is the Lord'—equal to, 'Let God be true, and every man a liar; He is sovereign, I am servant; whatsoever the Judge of the whole earth doeth shall be done in righteousness.'

'It is the Lord.' The highest religion could say no more. What more can there be than surrender to the Will of God? In that one brave sentence you forget all Eli's vacillation. Free from envy, earnest, humbly submissive—that is the bright side of Eli's character, and the side least known or thought of.¹

Resignation is too often conceived to be merely a submission, not unattended with complaint, to what we have no power to avoid. But it is less than the whole of a work of a Christian. Your full triumph as far as that particular occasion of duty is concerned will be to find that you not merely repress inward tendencies to murmur—but that you would not if you could alter what in any matter God has plainly willed. . . . Here is the great work of religion; here is the path through which sanctity is attained, the highest sanctity; and yet it is a path evidently to be traced in the course of our daily duties.²

2. Greater prominence is given in the Bible to the other side of Eli's character.

(1) Our attention is turned to the gross wicked-

¹ F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, 4th ser., 10.

² J. Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*, i. 216.

ness and scandalous behaviour of Eli's sons. There are many dark pictures in the history of Israel in the time of the Judges—pictures of idolatry, pictures of lust, pictures of treachery, pictures of bloodshed; but there is none more awful than the picture of the high priest's family at Shiloh. In the other cases members of the nation had become grossly wicked; but in this case it is the salt that has lost its savour—it is those who should have led the people in the ways of God that have become the ringleaders of the devil's army. Hophni and Phinehas take their places in that unhonoured band where the names of Alexander Borgia and many a high ecclesiastic of the Middle Ages send forth their stinking savour.

Eli knew what was going on and dealt with the state of things in the worst possible way. He spoke against it, but he did not act against it. 'I hear,' he said to his sons, 'of your evil dealings from all this people. Ye make the Lord's people to transgress.' The scandal went on. When the ark was sent to the camp, it was accompanied by Hophni and Phinehas. And every Israelite knew that, if Hophni continued to hold his present position, he would at no distant date sit in the seat of Aaron. Eli only talked to his sons; and we can understand how he may have persuaded himself that this was enough: that instead of making a painful resolution, it was better to leave matters alone. If he were to do more, was there not a risk that he might forfeit the little influence over the young men that still remained to him? Would not harsh treatment defeat its object, by making them desperate? Might they not attribute the most judicial severity to mere personal annoyance? If, after speaking to them, he left them alone, they would think over his words. Anyhow, they would soon be older; and as they grew older they would, he may have hoped, grow more sensible; they would see the imprudence and impropriety as well as the graver aspects of their conduct; they would anticipate the need for action on their father's part by a reformation of manners which would hush the murmurs and allay the discontent of Israel. And even if this could not be calculated on very securely, something might occur to give a new turn to their occupations; in any case, it might be better to wait and see whether matters would not in some way right themselves.

How this sin of Eli's, in his treatment of his sons, commenced, we cannot tell; probably in

their early childhood, when their evil dispositions began to show themselves, and he spared the rod and withheld correction. What his sin was, is very precisely pointed out;—‘he restrained them not.’ Doubtless he taught them; surely he prayed for them; he certainly exhibited to them the example of a holy and blameless life;—but he restrained them not. At first, he might have restrained them with, comparatively, a very gentle hand: a firm voice, a decided look, might have been enough; a few instances of patient, persevering determination, with an absence of all angry passion provoking them to wrath, might have taught the little rebels how hopeless it was to think of making their father yield to them; judicious kindness, not being bitter against them, would have made them feel the relief and gladness of yielding to him; and thereafter he might have guided them with his eye. Failing at that first stage to form in them the habit of obedience, Eli’s task became of course more difficult as his sons grew in strength and stature, as well as in force of will. The waywardness and impetuosity of early youth, succeeding to the insubordination of spoiled and fondled childhood, presented a touter aspect of resistance or defiance.

Self-government with tenderness—here you have the condition of all authority over children. The child must discover in us no passion, no weakness of which he can make use; he must feel himself powerless to deceive or to trouble us; then he will recognize in us his natural superiors, and he will attach a special value to our kindness, because he will respect

The rod produces an effect which terminates in itself. A child is afraid of being whipped, and gets his task, and there’s an end on’t.²

(2) It is true that Eli was a decrepit old man, from whom much vigour of action could not have been expected. But even if he was old and decrepit when the actual state of things first burst on his view, there was enough of the awful in the conduct of his sons to have roused him to unflinching activity. David was old and decrepit, lying feebly at the edge of death, when word was brought to him that Adonijah had been proclaimed king in place of Solomon, for whom he had destined the throne. But there was enough of the startling in this intelligence to bring back a portion of its youthful fire to David’s heart, and set him to devise the most vigorous measures to prevent

the mischief that was so ready to be perpetrated. Fancy King David sending a meek message to Adonijah—‘Nay, my son, it is not on your head but on Solomon’s that my crown is to rest; go home, my son, and do nothing more in a course hurtful to yourself and hurtful to your people.’ But it was this foolish and most inefficient course that Eli took with his sons. Had he acted as he should have acted at the beginning, matters would never have come to such a flagrant pass. But when the state of things became so terrible, there was but one course that should have been thought of. When the wickedness of the acting priests was so outrageous that men abhorred the offering of the Lord, the father ought to have been sunk in the high priest; the men who had so dishonoured their office should have been driven from the place, and the very remembrance of the crime they had committed should have been obliterated by the holy lives and holy service of better men. It was inexcusable in Eli to allow them to remain. If he had had a right sense of his office he would never for one moment have allowed the interest of his family to outweigh the claims of God.

For what were the interests of his sons compared with the credit of the national worship? What mattered it that the sudden stroke would fall on them with startling violence? If it did not lead to their repentance and salvation it would at least save the national religion from degradation, and it would thus bring benefit to tens of thousands in the land. All this Eli did not regard. He could not bring himself to be harsh to his own sons. He could not bear that they should be disgraced and degraded. He would satisfy himself with a mild remonstrance, notwithstanding that every day’s new disgrace was heaped on the sanctuary, and new encouragement given to others to practise wickedness, by the very men who should have been foremost in honouring God, and sensitive to every breath that would tarnish His name.

I should almost dare to say there are five generous men to one just man. The beauty of justice is the beauty of simple form; the beauty of generosity is heightened with colour and every accessory. The passions will often ally themselves with generosity, but they always tend to divert from justice. The man who strongly loves justice must love it for its own sake, and such a love makes of itself a character of a simple grandeur to which it is hard to find an equal.³

¹ *Amiel’s Journal*, 35.

² Johnson.

³ J. Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*, ii. 640.

(3) 'The best things when corrupted become the worst.' It is thus with official positions such as were held by the priests of old. Their positions were an hereditary right, and their duties consisted largely of a prescribed routine of services. It was required, however, that their personal character should accord with their sacred work (Mal 2⁷); and their influence was great for good or evil. Whilst they reflected in their character and conduct the moral condition of the times, they also contributed in no small degree to produce it. The sons of Eli employed their high office not for the welfare of men and the glory of God, but for their own selfish and corrupt purposes, and afford an example of 'great and instructive wickedness.' They were unspiritual men, and practically infidel. And they were such notwithstanding the instructions they received, the opportunities they possessed, and the services they rendered. Although the servants of God, 'they knew not God,' and were 'without excuse.' Not satisfied with the liberal portions of the peace offerings which were legally assigned to them (the breast and shoulder), they claimed other and larger portions, to which they were not entitled, and robbed the people for the gratification of their own appetites. What they would have fiercely denounced in others they deemed venial offences in privileged men like themselves. It was required by the Levitical law that the fat should be burnt on the altar before the offering was divided between the priest and the offerer; but instead of doing this, the priest sent his servant beforehand to demand his portion with the fat, that it might be better fitted for roasting than boiling, which was not to his taste. He thus appropriated to his private use what belonged to the Lord, and 'robbed God' of His due.

(4) Eli's feebleness arose out of original temperament. His feelings were all good: his acts were all wrong. In sentiment Eli might always be trusted: in action he was for ever false, because he was a weak, vacillating man. Therefore his virtues were all of a negative character. He was forgiving to his sons, because unable to feel strongly the viciousness of sin; free from jealousy, because he had no keen affections; submissive, because too indolent to feel rebellious. Before we praise a man for his excellences, we must be quite sure that they do not rise out of so many defects. No thanks to a proud man that he is not vain. No credit to a man without love that he

is not jealous: he has not strength enough for passion.

All history overrates such men. Men like Eli ruin families by instability, produce revolutions, die well when only passive courage is wanted, and are reckoned martyrs. They live like children and die like heroes. Deeply true to nature and exceedingly instructive is this history of Eli. It is quite natural that such men should suffer well. For if only their minds are made up for them by inevitable circumstances, they can submit. When people come to Eli and say, 'You should reprove your sons,' he can do it after a fashion; when it is said to him, 'You must die,' he can make up his mind to die: but this is not *taking* up the cross.

There was one peculiarity in Goethe's nature, namely, a singular hesitation in adopting any decisive course of action—singular, in a man so resolute and imperious when once his decision had been made. This is the weakness of imaginative men. However strong the volition, when once it is set going, there is in men of active intellects, and especially in men of imaginative, apprehensive intellects, a fluctuation of motives keeping the volition in abeyance, which practically amounts to weakness; and is only distinguished from weakness by the strength of the volition when let loose. Goethe, who was aware of this peculiarity, used to attribute it to his never having been placed in circumstances which required prompt resolutions, and to his not having educated his will; but I believe the cause lay much deeper, lying in the nature of psychological actions, not in the accidents of education.¹

(5) There can be no more fatal guide to a man setting out in life than the instinct which chooses what is agreeable, and avoids everything that is harsh and difficult. Many a graceful, amiable, and well-intentioned youth has thus reached an end of infamy. The character which shrinks from all collision with other men, which cannot face obloquy, which shrinks from inflicting pain, not because it hurts other people so much as because it shakes one's own nerves, which does all in its power to preserve the belief that this life is before all else for comfort and pleasure—this character is one of the most dangerous that wanders over this earth, dangerous for itself and dangerous for others also. Its apparent gentleness and goodness in the beginning arise mainly from the gaiety and good spirits of youth, and from the desire to stand well with everybody, which very desire will ultimately entangle him with sin, and devastate his life. There are times in most lives when the current of circumstances sets strongly towards sin, and when

¹ G. H. Lewes, *The Life of Goethe*, 492.

man will certainly sin if his rule of life has been to avoid all that is painful, and to choose what will for the time give him security and ease. The life of such a man, however promising it seems in youth, becomes weighted and entangled by a constantly accumulating burden of difficulties and sorrowful remembrances, and unavailing regrets, until at last he is, like Eli, almost glad to hear that what he has so long seen must be a losing game is over, and that his doom is imminent.

There was a man to whom I was very near, so that I could see a great deal of his life, who made almost every one fond of him, for he was young and clever and beautiful, and his manners to all were gentle and kind. I believe, when I first knew him, he never thought of anything cruel or base. But because he tried to slip away from everything that was unpleasant, and cared for nothing else so much as his own safety, he came at last to commit some of the basest deeds—such as make men infamous. He denied his father, and left him to misery; he betrayed every trust that was reposed in him, that he might keep himself safe and get rich and prosperous. Yet calamity overtook him.¹

II.

DIVINE DISCIPLINE.

1. We see in this story, the terribleness of God's displeasure. 'I will do a thing in Israel, at which both the ears of every one that heareth it shall tingle. . . . I have told him that I will judge his house for ever for the iniquity which he knoweth. . . . I have sworn unto the house of Eli, that the iniquity of Eli's house shall not be purged with sacrifice nor offering for ever.'

In a great battle, fought with the Philistines, the Israelites were defeated with the loss of about four thousand men. It was a serious blow, and produced deep searchings of heart among the elders. Wherefore, said they, 'hath the Lord smitten us to-day before the Philistines?' In their perplexity, they resolved to fetch the Ark of the Covenant out of Shiloh, thinking that, by some magic influence, it would help them to retrieve their fortunes in the field. Hophni and Phinehas joined in this impious freak, and we may suppose that Eli himself gave his sanction. It often happens that the most profane persons are the most superstitious; those who live in habitual forgetfulness of God are apt to lay great store by omens, witchcraft, and even paltry charms; and to these misguided men the Ark of the Covenant meant little more than

that. But they soon discovered that the symbol of the Divine presence was of no avail, when the reality was withdrawn.

Dragging the ark thither only removed God farther away. We need not be too hard upon these people; for the natural disposition of us all is to trust to the externals of worship, and to put a punctilious attention to these in the place of a true cleaving of heart to the God who dwells near us, and is in us and on our side, if we cling to Him with penitent love. Even God-appointed symbols become snares.

It was on March 21st, 1877, that, being full of St. Benedict as portrayed by Montalembert, and also in a peculiarly hopeless state about my own reform, straight in the teeth of my Protestant conscience, I prayed to the Saint, if perchance he might hear or help. I had really no faith in what I was doing, but clutched as a drowning man will at a straw. As well as I can remember I was reading Compline (as I did then at my night prayers) and had stopped in the middle of a psalm, by way of distraction, to make this experiment. I resumed in due course at the words: 'Quoniam in me speravit, liberabo eum; protegam eum quoniam cognovit nomen meum; clamabit ad me et ego exaudiam eum; cum ipso sum in tribulatione, eripiam eum et glorificabo eum,' etc. etc. I have lived on that, and two or three similar coincidences ever since.²

2. Is there in poetry or drama a more vivid and pathetic passage than the closing verses of this narrative, which tell of the panting messenger and the old blind Eli? 'Eben-ezer' cannot have been very far from Shiloh, for the fugitive had seen the end of the fight, and reached the city before night. He came with the signs of mourning, and, as it would appear from v.¹⁸, passed the old man at the gate without pausing, and burst into the city with his heavy tidings. One can almost hear the shrill shrieks of wrath and despair which first told Eli that something was wrong. Blind and unwieldy and heavy-hearted, he sat by the gate to which the news would first come; but yet he is the last to hear—perhaps because all shrank from telling him, perhaps because in the confusion no one remembered him. Only after he had asked the meaning of the tumult, of which his foreboding heart and conscience told him the meaning before it was spoken, is the messenger brought to the man to whom he should have gone first. How touchingly the story pauses, even at this crisis, to paint the poor old man! A stronger word is used to describe his blindness than in 1 S 3², as the

¹ George Eliot, *Romola*, ii. 388.

² *Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell*, i. 122.

Revised Version shows. His fixed eyeballs were sightless now; and there he sat, dreading and longing to hear. The fugitive's account of himself is shameless in its avowal of his cowardice, and prepares Eli for the worst. But note how he speaks gently and with a certain dignity, crushing down his anxiety—'How went the matter, my son?' Then, with no merciful circumlocution or veiling, out comes the whole dismal story.

The Divine symbol, with its overshadowing cherubim and its sacred light, into which year by year Eli had gone alone to sprinkle the blood of atonement on the mercy-seat, and where he had solemnly transacted with God on behalf of the people, was in an enemy's hands! The ark, that no Canaanite or Amalekite had ever touched, on which no Midianite or Ammonite had ever laid his polluted finger, which had remained safe and sure in Israel's custody through all the perils of their journeys and all the storms of battle, was now torn from their grasp! And there perishes with it all the hope of Israel, and all the sacred service which was associated with it; and Israel is a widowed, desolate, godless people, without hope and without God in the world; and all this has come because they dragged it away from its place, and these two sons of Eli's, now gone to their account, encouraged the profanation!

3. Of the utter ruin of Eli's household we need not speak. The priesthood passes away from his family; the government is upon other shoulders; his seed are a beggared race. The last incident recorded concerning his children is most profoundly touching; it is the birth of his grandson, the child of his son Phinehas. The unhappy mother hears of her husband Phinehas, fallen in the disastrous fight; and of her father-in-law Eli, suddenly dead. She cannot stand the shock. She bows her head, and the pangs of premature travail are upon her. The women about her say, 'Fear not; for thou hast born a son.' But there is no joy for her because a man-child is born into the world. She is a godly woman, broken-hearted by the sin and fate of an ungodly husband. She is like-minded with her husband's godly father, Eli. When the women tell her of the son she has born, 'she answered not, neither did she regard it.' But with her dying breath she named the child 'Ichabod'; for she said 'the glory is departed from Israel: because the ark of God was taken.'

The whole house of Eli is a ruin: the priesthood degraded; the nation defeated; the ark taken; and, amid the wreck, his own family broken up, and the sole survivor launched on the stream of time with an ominous name, and under a heavy curse. And all this in connexion with one of the meekest and holiest of the saints of God! It is a terrible lesson. And in keeping with it is the lesson taught by the melancholy notice of his own decease.

When the law of moral consequences is recognized as fixed and absolute, the hope to escape from it would be as great madness as to resist the law of gravitation. George Eliot's best known expression of this law is in *Romola*: 'Our deeds are like our children that are born to us; they live and act apart from our own will. Nay, children may be strangled, but deeds never: they have an indestructible life both in and out of our own consciousness.' This is the old Buddhist doctrine of Karma. St. Paul had put it still more briefly: 'Be not deceived: God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.'¹

Virginibus Puerisque.

Birthdays of Good Men and Women.

'And turning to the disciples, he said privately, Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see.'²—Lk 10²³.

There are many lovely homes in England, but few so beautiful as that in which Alfred Tennyson was born on a summer day in 1809. He was one of a large family—there were twelve children altogether—and the father was rector of a village church in Lincolnshire.

The Tennyson boys and girls had a very happy time. The boys were specially fond of games. But books were really their chief amusement; when the leaves were off the trees and the winds blew and the trees swayed and cracked they would tell each other stories. Alfred was the best of them all at romancing. One story of his lasted for months; it was called 'The Old Horse.'

Alfred loved his mother very dearly. From her he inherited his love of animals and his pity for 'wounded things.' She was a very religious woman. Long afterwards when he had become a great man, he said, 'She was the beautifullest thing that God Almighty ever made.'

You have, I feel sure, heard people speak of certain boys and girls as having an ear for music. When he was just a wee fellow—five years old—Alfred Tennyson heard music in the wind. A storm was sweeping through the Rectory garden;

¹ C. Gardner, *The Inner Life of George Eliot*, 117.

he ran from the house stretching out his little arms and crying,

'I hear a voice that's speaking in the wind.'

No wonder that he began to love poetry early. He heard music in the words of it. His brother Charles, who was rather older, did the same. When they were fifteen and seventeen years of age, they together issued a volume of poems, and Charles told afterwards how on the afternoon of its publication he and Alfred hired a carriage with some of the money earned, drove to their favourite seashore and shared their triumph with the wind and the waves.

You boys and girls know what it is to form a friendship apart from your brothers and sisters. Well, the Tennyson brothers went to Trinity College, Cambridge, to study, and there Alfred found a great friend in a fellow-student whose name was Arthur Hallam. He was very clever indeed and good as well. One meets boys, and girls too, who can never bring themselves to be enthusiastic over the work of a companion, or to listen in a good spirit when any friend tells them their faults.

Arthur Hallam looked up to Tennyson as to an elder brother, yet he was his critic. He could praise his friend's work or he could condemn it, and all the time the two loved each other even as David and Jonathan did.

Arthur Hallam died when he was twenty-two. Tennyson felt very very sad, but through constantly remembering that he was loved by his friend a new thought was born in his mind. That thought grew until by and by Death did not any longer mean to him separation from his beloved friend, but rather the gate to a higher and better life that was nearer to Arthur Hallam because nearer to God.

He wrote down his thoughts in a great poem called *In Memoriam*. That poem not only crowned him a king among poets, it spoke of God's love to those who could not always feel sure about it. Grown men and women spoke to each other of the new and brighter outlook. It was like seeing a halo of light where the gloom of death used to be. And so Tennyson became not merely a poet, but, through the love of a friend, the preacher of a gospel of gladness.

Many of you here know him only as the poet who wrote 'The May Queen.' It is a touching story told in words that make music: you want to

hear it again and again. You almost feel that you know the little May Queen, who came to be sure of God's love when she was very very ill. Tennyson loved her, he loved all little children, and had the heart of a child himself. When he was quite an old man he was made a Peer. Henceforth he was known as Lord Tennyson; but at eighty years of age the Peer remained the little child. We know that from a beautiful little poem he wrote then. He was thinking about death, for he was feeble and tired. But he was not afraid. The child's trusting heart was always there—don't you recognize it?

I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crost the bar.

He was afraid his son would not quite understand who the 'Pilot' was, so he explained Him as being 'That Divine and Unseen who is always guiding us'; who is guiding you, boys and girls.

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar,
When I put out to sea.

Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark!
And may there be no sadness of farewell,
When I embark;
For, tho' from out our bourne of time and
place
The flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crost the bar.

When you read or sing 'Crossing the Bar,' you will feel that the writer of it was a friend of yours—will you not?

'People, be Dood.'

'Who went about doing good.'—Ac 10³⁸.

Some of the boys and girls here know the name of John Ruskin. You know that he was a great writer and teacher of last century, and that the things he wrote were wise and beautiful and noble. Now I want to tell you about the first sermon John Ruskin ever preached. How old do you think he was when he preached it? Just three years! And what do you think he said?—'People, be dood. If you are dood, Dod will love you. If you are

not dood, Dod will not love you. People, be dood.'

Well, Ruskin was not much more than a baby then, and he didn't understand one of the most wonderful facts—that God loves us even when we are naughty, that He loves us all the time. Nevertheless I think it was very good advice that baby Ruskin gave, 'People be good'; and so I am going to say to you to-day, 'People, be good; boys and girls, be good.'

But what does being good mean? There have been many different ideas about that. Once upon a time men thought that to be good they must shut themselves away from the world. And some of them lived as hermits in dens and caves of the mountains and gave themselves up to fasting and reading holy books and saying long prayers. That was not Jesus' way. We read of His going apart into a desert place to pray, but that was only that He might talk with His Father and renew His strength for the work God had given Him to do. Jesus' way of being good was doing good. Our text tells us that He 'went about doing good'—not just thinking about it, or talking about it, but *doing* it. And so the best way to *be* good is to *do* good.

The other day I read a story about a father who was going from home for a short time, and as he was taking leave of his small son he said, 'Good-bye; be good.' 'Right-o, Father,' replied the small boy. A few days later father returned from his travels and his first question was, 'Well, Tommy, have you been a good boy?' 'Oh yes, Father,' was Tommy's prompt reply. But father had once been a boy himself, so he thought he would inquire a little further into matters. 'Well now, Tommy, did you do as your mother bade you?' Tommy was a truthful small boy, so he owned up that he hadn't always. 'And were you kind to Alec?' (Alec was the small brother.) 'Well, one day he made me awful mad and I struck him.' 'Then how do you make out that you were good?' 'Well, you see, one day I heard another boy say a bad word and I smacked him on the mouth.'

Tommy's father was wiser the next time he went from home. Instead of telling his son to be good, this is what he said, 'Do what your mother tells you, be kind to your small brother, speak the truth, and play fair.' That is the kind of thing that doing good means.

You know the world is made up of a great many different kinds of people, in fact there are about as many different kinds as there are people, but if we judge people by their deeds, I think there are four main classes.

1. First there are those who go about *doing harm*. I hope none of you belong to that class, for there are a few boys and girls in it as well as grown-ups. Wherever these people go they have a bad influence. If they get into a school, the whole tone of the school is lowered. If there are any such in your school don't have anything to do with them. You can be quite agreeable to them, but don't make them your chums or listen to their talk.

2. And then there are those who go about the world *doing mischief*. They are not intentionally bad these people. Very often they just mean to have a little fun. And so long as the mischief doesn't hurt others, there isn't much harm in it. But mischief has an unfortunate way of hurting others in a way we never thought of. For the mischievous people are generally the thoughtless people. Now I'm not going to mention the different kinds of mischief, because you know them just as well as I do, and if I happened to mention a particular kind you hadn't thought of, you might want to go and try it straight away. But I just want to say this. If you do wish a little fun and nonsense, try to choose the kind that doesn't hurt other people.

3. The third kind of people go about the world *doing nothing*. I don't mean to say that they are absolutely idle. Some of them are very busy indeed. Some are very busy making money, others are very busy enjoying themselves. But for all that they do to make the world better or happier or more beautiful, they might just as well not have lived.

There was a Roman Emperor once called Titus. And if he did not right some wrong or do some good thing each day he used to say to his courtiers, 'Alas! I have lost a day.'

Titus was only a heathen, but I think he might have put to shame many people who live in Christian lands. Don't be a 'do-nothing.' God sends us each day as a beautiful gift, and we must see to it that we make good use of it. What are you doing with your gift?

4. But lastly, there are the people who go about *doing good*. That was what Jesus did, and if we want to learn how to do good we must look to Him.

What kind of good did Jesus do? He made sick people well, He made sad people glad, He made bad people good. We can help to make sick people well, by being kind to them when they are ill, and by giving our pennies to the hospitals where the sick people are cared for. We can help to make sad people glad by a smile or a word or a loving look. We can help to make bad people good. How did Jesus do it? By being good Himself, by believing the best about them, and by loving them. And we can help to make people good in the same way—by living a beautiful life, by believing the best about others, and by loving them.

God has a big work to do in the world, and every little kind and helpful and unselfish and loving thing you do helps it on. Wouldn't you like to be God's helpers?

Somebody did a golden deed :
 Somebody proved a friend in need :
 Somebody sang a beautiful song :
 Somebody smiled the whole day long :
 Somebody thought, 'Tis sweet to live' :
 Somebody said, 'I'm glad to give' :
 Somebody fought a brave, good fight :
 Somebody loved to help the right :
 Was that somebody you?

Hidden Rocks.

'Hidden rocks.'—Jude 12.

What is the greatest treat when you are on holiday at the seaside? Paddling? No; better than that! Building sand castles? No; more exciting than that! Swimming? No; even jollier than that! What, then? Why, going for a row in a boat, of course! That is 'top hole' as you boys say, especially if you are allowed to steer for a bit, or take an oar occasionally. If you add to these joys the joy of dangling a line over the side of the boat and catching fish to fry for tea, you will agree with me that an outing like that is hard to beat. When you go for such a row I have a piece of advice to give you, and it is this. Take an old sailor man with you. Why? For two very good reasons—the first of which is that if you want to fish he will show you the best fishing ground; the second, that he will keep you clear of our text. Our text, like strong currents, is one of the dangers of going for a row on a coast you do not know. If you wish to find out what that

danger is turn up the Revised Version of the Bible at the second last book, the Epistle of Jude. In the twelfth verse you will find two words, 'hidden rocks,' and in these two words you have both the text and the danger.

Any sailor will tell you that hidden rocks are one of the worst dangers of an unknown coast. Sometimes you can tell that they are there from the white line of foam which breaks over them, and at very low tide you may see their black tops showing above water. Sometimes the water is perfectly calm and smiling above them, and there is no sign to tell you that they are beneath. But if the sun be shining and the water clear, lean over the side of the boat and you will catch a glimpse of their dark forms. You will notice that some are sharp and jagged like the teeth of a saw, others are rounded or covered with a thick coat of seaweed; but you feel that though they may look different they are all capable of knocking a very nasty hole in the bottom of your frail boat. Sometimes the channel between their hungry teeth is so narrow that the boat has to be steered very carefully to get you safely through. You are not so keen on holding the tiller then; you are only too thankful to hand it over to some one who knows the passage.

Boys and girls, the sea is not the only place where we find hidden rocks. We find them in everyday life; and the rocks we find there are even more dangerous than those to be found in the ocean. Strange to say, too, the hidden rocks of life, like the hidden rocks of the sea, are of two kinds. The first show a path of white above them. They hoist a danger signal. But the second are so hidden that we cannot tell they are there till suddenly one day a flash of light reveals them to us.

1. Now, for the first kind—those that hoist a danger signal. These are, I think, the wrong things that we know quite well we should not do, yet straightway go and do them. We know that they are dangerous, but we deliberately run our little boat on to them. What would you say of a sailor who steered straight for the foam that marked a hidden reef? You would call him either mad, or foolish, or both. Well, when you know a thing is wrong and yet do it, let me assure you you are equally mad and foolish.

Of course I know that often it is more difficult

to steer away from the rocks than to steer to them. People who want you to do wrong have a peculiarly maddening way of daring you to do it, and hinting that you are a coward if you refuse. When you come across such people, remember this. It is more splendid to be a moral hero than a merely physical hero. It is more splendid to turn a deaf ear to taunts and refuse to do what conscience whispers to be wrong, than it is to yield to mockings. Conscience is the foam on the hidden rock, and if we disregard it we deserve shipwreck. To run headlong into danger or temptation is no sign of bravery.

A gentleman once wished to engage a coachman. He had a number of applications from good men. How do you think he chose among them? He took them all to a certain road which lay between a hill on the right side, and a precipice on the left; and he asked each in turn how close to the edge of the precipice he could drive. One man said he thought he could drive within a foot, another said within nine inches, and a third was certain he could drive within six inches. The last man said, 'I should keep as far from the edge as I possibly could,' and the gentleman promptly engaged him.

2. What about the second kind of hidden rocks? I think these are like the many things we do every day without realizing that they are wrong. They lie hidden so deep in our heart and are so well concealed that we never suspect their existence; and just because we don't know of them, just because they hoist no danger signal, they are all the more dangerous. Lots of us would be tremendously surprised if we saw how selfish we were. We always thought that was just standing up for our rights. We should be surprised, and shocked too, to learn that we were mean and greedy. We always imagined we were just taking our share of the good things of life. Then others of us would be astonished to find that we were spiteful and revengeful, we had always thought that was merely paying people back in their own coin. Perhaps a few of us had been thinking ourselves perfect and patting our own backs and despising others, but we called that self-respect and did not think how hideous a fault it was. Boys and girls, look into your hearts to-day. Ask God to flash some of His own light into their darkness and discover to you their hidden faults.

Then, having discovered them, set about getting rid of them with His help. You know what is done to dangerous rocks in a harbour channel. They are blasted out with gunpowder. That is what we must do with the hidden rocks in our heart. We must blast them out; and we must ask God to help us to do it, for we shall never get rid of them without His aid.

The Christian Year.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Preacher as Prophet.

'Whom shall I send?'—Is 6⁸.

Those truths about God, those thoughts about life, which are to interpret men to themselves and God to men—how does the prophet attain to them? The answer, implied in the very name of prophet, is that he receives them from God. But let us look into this answer and see what it means. For there is a danger of superstition here, and of much loose and indefinite thinking. There is nothing magical in the reception of God's word by the prophet. In His communications with men, God uses regular and ascertainable means of imparting His message to them. Of course there are occasional exceptions to all such rules as this—eccentricities of inspiration, some of which may be quite beyond our power of explaining or analysing. But the normal process is clear. A man begins with *experience and study*; out of these rise *visions* of certain truths which are specially direct and certain; finally, these truths grow more and more imperative in their demand that he shall proclaim them, and that is the preacher's *call*.

1. *Experience*.—In order to be a true prophet, the preacher must know God and find out the truth about life, not by hearsay, but in his own experience. It is for his own soul that he must first find interpretations. He must drink deep draughts of life, living intensely and strenuously. Some prophets have written the message that they sent forth in their own hearts' blood, and no message has ever been or will ever be very convincing that has not a dash of the prophet's blood upon it. Behind every prophet's preaching there lies his wilderness, where he has fought alone with devils and been aware of the presence of both wild beasts and angels. There he must have wrestled with doubt until his thinking grew clear and articu-

late; he must have fought for character against temptation. So when he comes forth to men, he must ever seem to meet them as one who is fighting their battle on ground where he has won his own.

2. Along with experience there must be *study*, especially in an age like this, when the preacher's task is to interpret God and life to men who are reading widely for themselves. The message given to a preaching man is not a spontaneous and independent revelation, which would be identically the same whether he had read anything or not. Only extremists will tell you that the preacher ought simply to depend upon the guidance of the Spirit at the moment, and that diligence in preparation is incompatible with the prophetic ideal. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Every book read will contribute to the message, and become part of the inspiration of the Spirit. The opposite view corresponds exactly to that of the plenary and *verbatim* inspiration of the Scriptures in its crudest form, the relation between the Spirit and the man whom He inspires being simply that of flute-player and flute. The prophets of the Bible used for their prophesying every means of education available in their times and circumstances. Each of them was the child of the past as he knew it, and his knowledge of it, and of all else that he knew, can be traced in the things which he said. The modern study of the developing consciousness of Jesus is founded upon the presupposition that the same principle applies to the utterances even of the Saviour Himself. The fact is that there is no such phenomenon as a prophet receiving a message which is not affected, and so far limited, by his own knowledge acquired in ordinary ways. God does not give us revelations regarding matters of fact which our own study ought to give us; but if we shall be at pains to acquire knowledge, God will show us its bearings and its use. Study is not only compatible with prophetic utterance: it is absolutely essential to it. He who would aspire to the high office of the prophet must serve his apprenticeship as a humble and faithful student.

3. *Vision*. — Experience and study are not enough. Neither the man of experience nor the man of books is necessarily a prophet. There must be a selection among the various ideas and impulses gathered in these two ways—a selection not made voluntarily by the preacher, but made *in* him by a higher Power. Of all his varied gather-

ings, some will become different from the rest—more inevitable, more urgent. 'The first thing that is necessary in an orator,' says Hichens, 'if he is to be successful with an audience, is confidence in himself, a conviction that he has something to say which is worth saying, which has to be said.' This confidence will be found to attach itself not to the whole of any man's discourse, but to a certain part of it which includes only the man's enthusiastic convictions. These detach themselves from the rest of his opinions, and become a kind of intuitive and brilliant group of certainties, which form the core or nucleus of his thinking. Such groups may well come under the name of vision, for the note of them is their certainty and directness of truth. Regarding these, John Bunyan writes: 'I could not be contented with saying, "I believe and am sure"; methought I was more than sure.'

4. There is one thing more in the full equipment of the prophet, and that is his *call*. Vision by itself does not constitute a call. A man may find certain groups of ideas rise within him to such brilliance as to assume the absolute mastery over his life, and to become 'the light of all his seeing,' and yet he may feel no call to proclaim those ideas to others. A vision becomes a call only when there comes upon the man who has received it a passionate desire to impart it to others. It is when vision becomes imperative, when a man must either speak out or break his heart, when he cannot be content with holding convictions but must strive to make them the convictions of others, that his call has come.¹

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Lift up your Eyes.

'Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest.'—Jn 4³⁵.

The vision that floats before me is a vast synthesis of all the experience which the human race has ever had or ever will have had.

1. First, we must have full trust in reason to verify and define the facts of that experience. The Agnostic is out of court, whether he calls himself a Christian or something else. We shall want everything that philosophy can tell us of the working of the divine within us, the whole teaching of science about its working in the world, the

¹ J. Kelman, *The War and Preaching*.

most searching criticism to unravel its course in history; and we shall need the highest of culture to throw over all the divine charm of grace and beauty.

2. But this is not enough: no man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. No one man born in sin can reach the many-sided fulness of truth. We need a deeper social science to set our relations to each other in a fuller light of truth, and to shape our society more after the dim outline of that kingdom of God which every Theist must believe in, though he may not call it by a Christian name.

3. But this again is not enough. As no one man can cover the divine expanse of truth, so neither can any one nation. After all the advances we boast of in our civilization, we have inherited by far the largest part of it from the past. History was old when the Pyramids were built, Greece and Israel already stand on the platform of an ancient civilization, and every generation has added to the august tradition which is now the common heritage of cultured nations. But Asia must help us too. It is impossible that the new-born energy of Japan should never have anything better to teach us than the mere craft of war. The ancient wisdom of India may well have a new career before it, now that we ourselves have made for ever vain her immemorial barriers of the Indus and the desert. More than this, I can well believe that some of the noblest work of a not distant future may come from peoples on whose ancestors we ourselves look down as proudly as of old imperial Rome looked down upon our own.

4. Can we stop here? Is not all this enough? Certainly it is not. All this may be vast and grand; but all this as yet is dead. We may have philosophy and science, criticism and culture in perfection, and a finely organized society too, and still have no life in us. But where shall the spark of life be found? The deep saith, It is not in me; the sea saith, It is not with me: yet it is found in the land of the living. Now you must not mistake me if I tell you what it is. The spark of life is mysticism. I do not mean the follies and worse than follies which bear the name, but the conviction, acted on if not expressed, that a true communion with the divine is given to all that purify themselves with all the force of heart and soul and mind. If there is a man without a touch of this mystic faith, that man is dead while he liveth; for there can be no personal religion, and

therefore no true religion, without something of it. Its most definite form is the Christian—he that hath this hope in God purifieth himself as the Man of Nazareth was pure. But it may be quite as real when it is much less definite than this, or not even consciously expressed at all. Those of us who believe in a true light whose ever-present coming into the world lighteth every man, are beyond all others bound to confess that every work which is done on the face of the wide earth for love or duty is as truly communion with God as the Supper of the Lord itself can be, from the Three Hundred in the pass to the child in the slums who gives his last penny to one that needs it more than he does. Here is the secret of the knowledge of God. One common duty done with a true heart will teach more of it than any amount of learning. And it is just the common duties that teach more of it than the great victories. The Man of Nazareth showed His knowledge of men as well as of things divine when He gave us to understand that it is a greater work to give the cup of cold water than to raise the dead. And in these 'greater works' there can be no distinction of race and rank, of age and sex, of learned and simple, and least of all of Christian and pagan. The Church of the first-born which are written in heaven is not limited by election or formal conversion, or even by the Christian name. Its doors are open to all that seek and follow truth, for, as Hort would say, every thought of the heart which is in any sense unworthy is first of all untrue.

Many years ago it was my fortune to spend a Sunday in the great and ancient city of Lyons. Towards evening we climbed the height of Fourvières. A glorious historic site was at our feet, with memories reaching backward to the Council which smote the Hohenstaufen Empire into ruins, and backward still to the time when the threescore states and five of Gaul came year by year to render thanks to heaven for the blessings of the Roman peace. They told us that we could see the Alps. But I looked vainly into the mists that were gathering over the broad plain beyond the meeting of the rivers. 'Look higher': and there they were. High in the air above, the last rays of sunshine lighted up those glorious domes of rosy snow, full seventy miles away. Like those mountains is the revelation of God in history and in your own life. You will not find it in the mists of selfishness and cherished sin. Lift up your hearts, and you will see it looking down on you. But it is not the setting sun which lights the Church of God, the Church of all that love and follow truth. It is the light of the morning, the light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.¹

¹ H. M. Gwatkin, *The Knowledge of God*, ii. 325.

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Character of the Kingdom.

'The kingdom of God is at hand.'—Mk 1¹⁵.

Jesus presented the idea of the Kingdom in various aspects and in different forms, but withal there was a remarkable unity running through all His teachings.

1. He represents the Kingdom of God as primarily a *subjective state of the individual*. He laid decided stress on its personal and spiritual aspects. He declared, 'The Kingdom of God is within you'; and again, 'the pure in heart shall see God.' The Kingdom comprises the moral principles and emotions. In so far as it was established in the person of its members, it was invisible and spiritual. The ruling thought in His mind was that the Kingdom was first a present and spiritual realm. He was to rule within the sphere of human impulses, desires, and affections. He was to hold court in the human heart. The internal thoughts and affections were to be the seat of His throne. Personal loyalty was the ground of obedience. He was to rule through an experience born of personal affection. His will was not to be enforced through magistrates and rulers, but through a consciousness of His presence acting in the life of the individual. His subjects were to do right from the love of right. Their acts of justice and mercy were to be illumined with the light of love so that the law of righteousness should become to them the perfect law of liberty. The conscious nearness of the personality of God as a living, working force in human affairs would awaken in His followers a new centre of interest and hope. It would enable them to find rapture of soul in His service. His Kingdom in this sense was one of cheer and gladness.

2. Jesus likewise applied the term Kingdom of God to a *present objective in society* as well as to the interior spiritual reality for the individual. He taught broad, general principles which were applicable to different circumstances and to different ages. They were to find adequate expression in every sphere of human activity. The implication of His teachings is that the individual is to attain perfection in and through the perfection of society. The Kingdom is to begin in the individual mind and heart and then grow until it embraces the universal interests of all mankind. It is primarily a spiritual Kingdom but having physical aspects.

The material world is the arena of its conflicts and triumphs. In so far as His ideals and spirit dominate human institutions and interpenetrate the various forms of the associated and complex life of the community they become part of His Kingdom. The Home, the Church, and the State are included in its extent.

3. The Kingdom is to be *realized in this world*. The simple and comprehensive petition, 'Thy kingdom come, thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven,' which Jesus taught, upholds the lofty ideals of the Kingdom to be realized in this world. Its whole import shows that it is thoroughly human. In His opening address He says, 'The kingdom of heaven is at hand.' He speaks of it as coming nigh unto His hearers who did not conceive of it as an abstract ideal but rather as a living reality. They were to consider it a present fact and a present opportunity confronting every man. It was to be this world illumined and morally crowned. At His coming the Kingdom began to be realized. He did not confine His teaching to represent the Kingdom as something beyond the clouds that was to be postponed to the future world, but it was to be realized in fact. It was a Kingdom of right relations among men established here and now but progressively realized.

4. Jesus also presents the Kingdom under the *aspect of a future event*. Many of His statements corresponded with the popular conception of the day that the Kingdom was to be inaugurated by a future crisis. The apocalyptic aspect of the Kingdom is taught in a series of parables recorded in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew. These parables indicate that they are to have their climax in the final results. The fact that Jesus represents the Kingdom of God as a future apocalyptic event does not conflict with His previous social teaching. It is both a present and a future event. The Kingdom begins in the individual heart and then manifests itself as a vital force in upbuilding the Kingdom in the earth, and finally reaches its culmination in the future and eternal Kingdom. The earth is to be the place of the perfected Kingdom, but not the whole of it. The millennium will come by the increased dominance of Christ's quiet and persistent influence until the whole human family is under His control. The Kingdom, like the grain of mustard seed, begins imperceptibly and through its unobtrusive and continuous influence in society, grows until it becomes a conquering power

in the world and finally reaches a state of heavenly perfection.¹

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Revolutionary Christ.

'Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time . . . but I say unto you.'—Mt 5²¹.

There are three ways in which Christ made a revolution in the thought and life of His contemporaries.

1. In their ideas about right and wrong. And in two ways.

(1) He relaxed none of the old prohibitions of the Ten Commandments, He 'fulfilled' them; that is, He developed them and added to them in more ways than one. For example, the old law took the form, 'Thou shalt not.' He added, 'Thou shalt.' Now, have we quite realized what a very great step this was in the moral and religious education of the world? 'Thou shalt not'—'Don't do this,' 'Don't do that,' is the law of the nursery, as every one remembers. It is always reminding the child of its naughtiness. It marks a great advance for any one when his eyes are opened to see that a far higher rule of life consists in 'Thou shalt.' This reminds every child of its capacity for goodness. That is the appeal which brings out all that is best in every one. See what it is doing to-day for Boy Scouts and Girl Guides. It is one of the open secrets of a public school. It is the 'Thou shalt,' for the good of the house and the school, that makes a man out of a child. Think what the adoption of 'Thou shalt' as the motto of life, in place of the old repressive 'Thou shalt not,' has done for girls and women during the war. 'Thou shalt,' with an appeal to principle, is the education of individuality, of independent thought. It is spiritual emancipation. It gives free play for the Divine in manhood and womanhood to express itself. It puts religion far above the plane of fear, and lifts it to the plane of love. It marks an immense advance.

(2) But Christ developed the old standard of morality in another direction. In addition to forbidding the wrong act He forbade the wrong thought. It was not the crime, which the law can deal with, that came first with Him, but the sin, the wrongness in thought, that came first. That

development revolutionized our standard of judging ourselves. It demands holiness instead of respectability. And respectability is a very different thing from holiness. Again, I do not say that we have learnt the lesson; but we know that we must learn it if we live in the spirit of Christ. This difference also points to a more spiritual thought of God, a loftier theology introduced by Christ.

2. Another revolution which Christ made was in the idea of worship of God. This is less familiar, because few of us have enough detailed knowledge of what the authorized national worship of God was like in Christ's day, even among the Jews, to realize what a revolution it was that Christ wrought. We get in the Gospels a few glimpses of Jewish worship: we read a few allusions to sacrifices going on in the Temple—killing animals as a mode of approaching God; a few allusions to rules about the Sabbath, rubbing ears of corn in one's hands being unlawful, for example; about clean and unclean foods; about washing hands and cups and similar trifles as religious duties.

But most of us do not know enough of all this to realize that this was the authorized conception of the service due to God; that the professional teachers had relegated to a secondary place the grand words of the old prophets; and that they had reverted to childish and almost heathen conceptions of God. It is a ceaseless danger. Routine and externals are so easy a religion; spiritual effort is so hard.

Now, put side by side with this our Lord's teaching. He does not undervalue the discipline of careful and reverent obedience. 'These things ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone'; and 'the other' were the weightier matters of the law, judgment and mercy and faith and the love of God. What must we infer from this startling contrast? Must it not be that Christ had a wholly different thought of God from theirs? Was it not because of this difference that He taught that the service of God must be different from theirs? That is the only possible conclusion.

3. There is a third difference in Christ's teaching, the difference in attitude towards our fellow-men. Christ declared that respect, mutual service, brotherhood, love, ought to take the place of indifference and competition and strife for mastery. When He said, 'So it shall not be among you,' He announced a new social, industrial, political,

¹ J. M. Barker, *The Social Gospel and the New Era*, 6.

international, practical principle of infinite importance, of which the world is only beginning now to see the possibilities. This also plainly shows Christ's thought of God as a life and Spirit, inspiring every human soul, and therefore demanding for every human soul our respect and reverence

and love. We shall never wish to recur to the old elementary morality, the old sacrificial worship, the old hostile relations of men and nations to one another. As little ought we to wish to cling to the old thought of God from which they sprang.¹

¹ J. M. Wilson, *Christ's Thought of God*.

The Use of Sign and Symbol in Worship.¹

BY THE REVEREND H. J. WOTHERSPOON, D.D., EDINBURGH.

IN the life of the Spirit, worship is an important element; and in worship symbolism is probably more or less necessary, and is presumably in some measure serviceable. In that aspect—of edification and of assistance to devotion, and not in the æsthetic or antiquarian—I propose to consider the subject assigned to me. Worship is communion with God. Public worship is also communion of man with man, involving, therefore, the psychology of the group. Is it, as such, helped by the use of sign and symbol? Can we by such use reach better expression towards God, or realize better a common consciousness in Divine things? Can we thereby find a greater joy, or obtain a closer fellowship with one another? That is, I take it, our question, and when it is put in that broad way, the answer would, I think, with all due precaution and qualification, be necessarily in the affirmative, and the question would remain a question rather of degree.

Certain distinctions might be necessary:—we must not confuse symbolism with ritual, or with ceremony, or with ornament. Ritual has to do with *rite*—and a rite is an act of Divine service (such as, *e.g.*, marriage or confirmation), and it may include the use of symbol, or it may not. Ceremony, again, relates entirely to the manner of doing things, which must be done somehow, and may be better done in a manner agreed. Ornament, on the other hand, is an attempt at beauty, generally unsuccessful. Ornament may of course be symbolic—for example, we may, very inappropriately, paint the cross on floor tiles, to be trodden under foot: but the symbolism has nothing to do with beauty, and decoration has no necessary connexion with symbolism.

The criterion of symbolism is significance, and its significance is its whole value, which is more likely to lose by elaboration than to gain. Two bits of stick are tied together and set on a grave mound in France—there you have the symbol complete, and it means more thus than the marble which the Director of Graves may by and by substitute for it. *Sunt lacrimae rerum, et mentem mortalia tangunt.*

One should distinguish, too, between the symbol and the sign. The rude cross on the soldier's grave is a symbol—the dented helmet which lies on the mound below it is not a symbol, but a sign. Both of them 'touch the mind,' but in different ways. The symbol is metaphorical—the sign is factual; the symbol implies something abstract—the sign reminds of something that has happened or that is true. In marriage, for example, the ring is a symbol—of perpetuity and fidelity: the grasping of hands is a sign, *de presenti*, of the covenant then made. The cross is a symbol of sacrifice, the crucifix is not a symbol, but a sign—it reminds of the actuality of the Atonement, that Christ bore our sins actually thus on the gibbet. A symbol signifies—a sign shows. A sacrament does both.

As for the legitimacy of symbol: its philosophic background is in the nature of things and in our constitution. '*The invisible things of God,*' says the Apostle, '*are from the creation of the world clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made.*' Everywhere the material is expressive of the spiritual. The Divine thought repeats itself in more speeches than one, and on more planes than one; so the spiritual is echoed and repeated in the physical. '*Things made,*' are expressive of truths. Nature is one vast symbolism—the Universe is sacramental—it is the

¹ An address delivered at Aberdeen, September 19, 1919.

outward sign of the inward and heavenly. The concrete and the abstract correspond and answer to one another. Light and truth, darkness and evil, these have more than analogy—they connote each other, something identical expresses itself in each of their languages. God, the God of truth, has said, ‘*Let there be light.*’ We who are in God’s likeness understand both forms of speech: the voice of creation and the voice of the Spirit, who bears witness with our spirit—both are intelligible to us, and both carry to us the same messages. In the speech which addresses itself to our senses, we recognize light as the same term which in the world of thought we know as truth or in the world of emotion as joy, while darkness is the material expression of ignorance, evil, sorrow. Again, the right line in some way describes the right action: the crooked line depicts the ways of crooked men. These correspondences are not fanciful—they are real: and on them depends our power of ordered thought and of communicated thought. All language is primarily symbolic—its terms are originally physical terms. *Rectus* means ‘strong’ before it comes to mean ‘righteous.’ We discover community of experience first in physical relations, and from that we obtain a nomenclature for community of experience in the abstract and subjective. And this primary characteristic of the vehicle of thought does not, at later points, lose its efficiency: we constantly return upon it to verify and to simplify our abstractions—as, for example, in our more recent metaphysic with its uncouth vocabulary of ‘this-ness’ and ‘that-ness,’ ‘thus-ness’ and ‘other-wise-ness,’ ‘here-ness’ and ‘there-ness.’ All poetry and all genuine art (*i.e.* all suggestive art) are made possible only by this sacramental-ness of nature. Take from us the simile and the metaphor and the consciousness of the *lacrime rerum*, the vision of nature as symbolic—poetry and art would be somewhat crippled of apparatus. Consider any of our Lord’s parables—what is it but a quotation from nature or from the fact of things? Yet He reasons from it.

Deity indeed would seem to be the supreme symbolist, and we inevitably the imitators, as soon as we too begin to deal with things of God, whether to think of them or to speak. If one goes to Scripture—if one admits any prophetic origin to Old Testament systems of worship, any Divine prescription to the Old Testament methods

of communion with God, or any foundation of inspiration to prophecy itself—then one finds oneself involved in the sanction of symbolism as the natural vehicle of worship, and in the conception of worship as a body of symbolisms. Set all that aside, if you feel free to do so, as obsolete and of another dispensation (though the Divine nature and human nature and the nature of things persist as they were)—come into the new age of realities in the Spirit: and you find that the central rites of the new life, the spiritual life, are symbols and much more—symbol and reality blent into sacrament; and in the sacrament (if our ‘Confession’ stands for true witness) you find the living Christ, and the flowing Spirit of God. So far as rite or worship are prescribed by our Lord, they are sacramental: and whatever else sacrament may be, it is first and on the face of it, *symbol*.

There is perhaps something besides in such suggestion as the Apocalypse supplies in its descriptions of the worship of Heaven. The worship there described is symbolic in setting and acts: the altar, the Lamb, the white garments, the crowns, the palms, the harps, the incense, the gestures are symbols: without them there would not remain much except the Tersanctus, the Ascriptions, and the responsive Amens. Of course the whole vision is symbolic, and therefore perhaps there is the less to be learnt from its details, so far as these illustrate our subject. Yet there is this, that one would hardly expect to find the harmful or the forbidden or the useless employed to describe for us what it is intended to represent as the pattern in the heavens. So far as a general review of Scripture may take us, the symbolic and the significant do not, in fact, seem to be proscribed. One might almost be carried so far as to suppose that their use was encouraged, or at least was regarded as natural—perhaps as in some degree requisite for the expression of things otherwise unutterable. For, as the sacraments imply, there is after all an irreducible minimum of symbolism; at least, if even that minimum is to be avoided, we must adopt the methods of Quakerism, and abandon what most Christians hold for normal and fundamental to Christian worship. And there are symbols of universal sanction, such as the uplifted hand of benediction, which comparatively few of us disuse. The question after all is one of degree.

And so I think it ought to be. No one can

very well contend that any frequent or extensive use of symbolism is *necessary* to worship. Mohammedanism demonstrates the contrary; for Mohammedanism excludes the use of symbol (except in gesture), and yet has a vivid and universally observed worship. On the other hand, it must be remembered that Mohammedanism has extremely little to symbolize. Its creed is a brief negative, *there is no God but God*—with as brief a citation of testimony, *And Mohammed is His prophet*. One cannot symbolize a negative, or a man. Mohammedanism is the religion of the *moyen homme sensuel*, be he Scot or Arab:—a belief that there is a God, and fate (or luck), and heaven for all but exceptional rascals, once they are dead. It is the common creed of the ordinary man—and it needs no symbol, for it has no mystery, nothing higher than the average sensual life which suggests it. Occasion for symbol arises in proportion to the richness of faith, the complexity of religious experience, and the apprehension of the mystery of God.

The power of the symbol, I repeat, lies in its significance. It can suggest so much, and so instantly, and to all simultaneously: and that without elaboration or the chilling pause which any attempt to say in words the same thing must impose. Take the commonest of symbols, one which I have already instanced—the uplifted hand of blessing; see how it moves a multitude, imposes a mood, bends all in one emotion as the wind sweeps the cornfield. Consider how much it summarizes—of God the Father, of the mission of Christ which in the act re-emerges from the heavens, of the communion of the Holy Ghost, of the forgiveness of sins, of the fellowship of the flock, of the presence of the supernatural in the Church. All that is implied, and those who are submitted to it feel together in thus meeting the thought of God, the faith of Christ, the pulse of the Spirit's life. Or, again, how long will it take to say what is said by those two bits of stick on the soldier's grave? how else could you say it to every passer-by? how else touch every heart to the message? There you have the power of the symbol to unite, to embrace in one atmosphere the whole group with which you desire to deal. The symbol creates its own atmosphere. It is able to suggest—it appeals to imagination and association. It brings together the distant in time and space—what it means to us it has meant to so many of

all the ages—what it means to us it means to men of our faith the world over. And it has the power of allusion: on the moment it brings before the mind a world of recollection, and places the soul in contact with its beliefs and hopes. It finds the shortest way to the heart. I think again of the cross on the soldier's grave and its infinite implication—of sacrifice, redemption, peace, promise, of the 'body still united to Christ,'—could any inscription say as much? or say it and be felt, as all men understand this? Obviously the symbol has certain values of expression and appeal which words attain with difficulty. It is significant, and conveys its significance without the cumber of mental effort or the challenge to thought, which the intellectual statement provokes. Hence its restfulness, itself a great value.

Whether these values can safely and profitably be appropriated to the service of worship is an open and fair question. Something certainly may be lost by disuse of the symbolic and significant: we may fall into dulness—we may lose ourselves in a dry intellectualism: worship may perish in dialectic—it may find itself left with only one side of human nature to which to appeal, and with only one method of addressing even that. Instead of worship, we may end in discussion; instead of communion we may have criticism. In the sum of it, we may reach a certain staleness; we may become wearisome to one another; we may find ourselves alone with the few who are capable of interest in discussion, or are equal to the sustained effort of intellectual appreciations. It is again an open and fair question whether we have not already reached this condition.

On the other hand, symbolism in worship has its undoubted dangers. It may be dangerous by excess, or by its fascination, and the pursuit of it for its own sake. It may overlay the understanding. It may drift into complication, multiplication, triviality. It may obsess worship. It may overtax the imagination and memory. It may become spiritually obsolete—for symbolism is always open to this risk, that its origin and sense may be forgotten in habit. The cross itself—it can be used meaninglessly, superfluously, commonly—without recollection: floriated and distorted and powdered about as a decoration for blank spaces: none considering its grimness or its glory.

That, however, is no more than to say that symbols are only for significance, and that, if they

lose significance, they are nothing at all. To conserve them as being anything, they had perhaps need to be few, simple, obvious, and very carefully protected for significant use—if it were practicable, I should wish to say, regulated use. The unauthorized symbol may be as irksome as fancy ritual can be.

A symbol is no symbol unless it is significant; and to be significant, it must be understood. Even the Sacraments need constant exposition—it is a sound canon of our practice that with the ordinance must go the Word—else the Sacraments themselves may become merely conventions (as Baptism, for lack of the Word to go with it, is in danger of becoming). A symbol, therefore, has the less value, unless it is vernacular to the people's thoughts, and unless for its meaning it is acceptable. In order to unite in one mind and impulse, the symbol must mean the same to all and be received of all. The Union Jack is an example of such a symbol. The Red Flag, on the other hand, is intelligible enough, and it may be trusted to move any assemblage—but it will not unite: there are those whom it is pretty certain to provoke.

This consideration is, I think, of importance when the question is one of symbolism in worship. The purpose is to edify—what cannot be done to edification had better not be done at all. Things may be lawful which are not expedient.

One may discuss such matters *in vacuo*, as I have been doing, considering symbolism simply on its merits and as it is in the nature of things. And if one does so, symbolism may certainly appear to have philosophic basis and scriptural sanction; one may recognize that it answers to a human instinct, even to a human need. One may think it to be a congruous aid to worship, holding as it does in presence of the mind beliefs which should never be absent from consciousness, yet do not admit of constant verbal repetition. One may see that it supplies a language for worship in which those may agree, whom dialectic statements would set in antagonism. One may even think that symbolism has this peculiar power because of a certain intrinsic spirituality, which gives it a universal appeal. And for such reasons one may wish that its use were native to our habit of mind, and that it could be freely and happily utilized in our spiritual life. I am doubtful, however, how far under present conditions any such free and happy

use is possible. All things must be with a view to edification—and edification cannot be compulsory. There can be little process of edification within an atmosphere of nervousness, suspicion, or antagonism. I am therefore no advocate of the use of symbol or sign in worship beyond the understanding and the sympathies of our people. There are, however, canons of common sense which they will always appreciate. That which has to be done in some way, let it be done in a way which is significant of truth. That which has to exist in some form, let its form be expressive rather than meaningless. These simple rules cover a good deal, and most men will approve them. For the rest, if one desires a symbol, let him see that it is understood; but also, let him see that what it expresses is already in the people's heart. Our first task is to *teach the faith*. Where the faith is held in power and fulness, it will seek expression in all forms that offer themselves.

There are, however, certain primary and inevitable symbolisms to which either with a positive or else with a negative implication we cannot avoid being committed: those, namely, of *place, speech, and gesture*. For if we meet, we must meet somewhere; and being met, we must either speak or be silent; and some gesture of body we must assume. And these things are significant.

As to the first of them, our places of religion, there is comparatively little difficulty. Edifices expressive of worship are welcomed, often demanded. Now the edifice is itself the chief vessel of worship and in a sense its primary symbol. It means much that from the people themselves there comes the requirement that it should speak less exclusively of man and his need of instruction, more of God and of His glory and praise.

We less readily apprehend or appreciate the symbolism of united speech. Our people are without active vocal part in profession or in prayer. They are slow to assume it, and the ministry is slow to invite them to it. Yet what else gives expression to the priesthood of believers, or permits the sense of fellowship in faith and worship? Where responsive worship is heartily practised, it has certainly remarkable emotional value.

The most important, however, of all symbolisms, the simplest and the fundamental, is, I think, that of the personal gesture of the worshipper. That counts for more in the truth of the spirit than any apparatus of furnishing, and more than any action

which is not the man's own, but is the gesture or act of the officiant on his behalf? Apart from the divinely instituted Sacraments, as to which there is no question, this is the only department of symbolism which seems to me to be of immediate and inevitable importance. Because it is a symbolism in which we have no choice but every one of us to engage—we must worship in some attitude, and all attitudes are expressive; but much more, because attitude of body has intimate reflex influence on the attitude of mind and soul. As to this influence of body upon mind in our organism, modern psychology is clear. A threatening gesture awakes in us a threatening mood; a submissive gesture evokes a submissive mood. As the soldiers' song taught us (and it was scientifically accurate), the way to feel cheerful is to 'smile, smile, smile.' It helps then to reverence, if we place ourselves in posture of reverence; it helps us to pray, if we

assume an attitude of prayer. A grave mistake was (I humbly think) made, when about the sixties of last century we left our ancient and indeed primitive custom of standing in public prayer—religion lost more by that than it has gained or could gain by the acquisition of organs or insertion of painted windows. These are really 'externals' to worship, and to the worshippers; gesture of body, on the other hand, is no more external to him than gesture of soul—one's body is not external to oneself; gesture is of the man, and it affects him in the spirit. From the point of view of the spiritual life, nothing else within this range of consideration seems of comparable importance. Everything that is pretty, and even some things that are edifying, might profitably be sacrificed, if thereby it were possible to recover that which is reverent. It is by example rather than by precept that the recapture may be effected.

Contributions and Comments.

'No one shall snatch them out of my hand.'

It does not seem to have been recognized (there is, e.g., no reference in R.V. or W.H.) that Jesus was quoting or echoing an O.T. prophecy when He said, 'They shall never perish, and *no one shall snatch (ἀρπάξει) them out of my hand.* My Father, which hath given them unto me, is greater than all; and *no one is able to snatch (ἀρπάζειν) out of my Father's hand.* I and my Father are one' (Jn 10²⁸⁻³⁰).

It seems clear, however, that our Lord must have been referring definitely to Is 43¹⁸. 'Yea, from everlasting I am He, and *there is none that can deliver (lit. snatch) out of my hand*' (וְאֵין מִיָּדוֹ מוֹצֵל). מוֹצֵל, which is one of the many words for 'deliver' in Hebrew, has the particular significance of 'pull away' or 'snatch.'

The quotation appears to have been made directly from the Hebrew, rather than through the LXX, which is somewhat colourless (καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ καὶ τῶν χειρῶν μου ὁ ἐξαιρούμενος).

The recognition that our Lord had this Scripture in mind throws some light on that hard saying in Jn 17¹² . . . 'that they may be one even as we

are. While I was with them I kept them in thy name, which thou hast given me, and I guarded them, and not one of them perished, but the son of perdition, *that the Scripture might be fulfilled.*'

It has generally been taken for granted that the words 'that the Scripture might be fulfilled' were concerned with the 'perishing' of the 'son of perdition.' The R.V., e.g., refers to Ps 109⁸: 'Let his days be few and let another take his office.' Westcott prefers to take Ps 41⁹ as the Scripture in question: 'Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me.' Now these two passages are quite apposite, even though perhaps superficially so, in Ac 1²⁰ and Jn 13¹⁸, where they are respectively cited. But neither of them is sufficiently relevant to the only point here raised, namely, the 'perishing' of the 'son of perdition,' to justify the advertisement of them as Scriptures that had been fulfilled. To drag them in is, in fact, far-fetched.

It seems much more probable that the words 'but the son of perdition' are parenthetic, and that the fulfilment of Scripture spoken of has no connexion with them at all, but with the main thoughts in the verse 'I kept them . . . I guarded them, and not one of them perished.'

We are here evidently in exactly the same circle of ideas as in Jn 10²⁸⁻³⁰, as may be seen by the following comparisons :

- { 'My Father which hath given them to me' (10²⁹).
- { 'them . . . which thou hast given me' (17¹²).
- { 'I and the Father are one' (10³⁰).
- { 'that they may be one even as we are' (17¹²).
- { 'they shall never perish' (10²⁸).
- { 'not one of them perished' (17¹²).

Lastly, as we have seen, we have in 10²⁸, 'no one shall snatch them out of my hand,' and in 10²⁹ 'no one is able to snatch them out of my Father's hand,' quotations, hardly modified at all, of the Scripture Is 43¹³, 'and there is no one who shall snatch out of my hand.' And these quotations have their counterpart in 17¹² in the words 'that the Scripture might be fulfilled.'

It is reasonable therefore to suppose that it was the same Scripture in both cases which our Lord had in mind. In both passages, in somewhat different ways, He claims to be the fulfilment of this prophetic saying which at the first was spoken in reference to God the Father, but which was likewise true of Himself, for He had shown Himself and would further show Himself to be, in fact, 'one with the Father.'

If these conclusions are correct, Jn 17¹² when expanded would read as follows: 'While I was with them I kept them in thy name which thou hast given me, and I guarded them, and [except the son of perdition] no one of them perished, thus fulfilling the Scripture which says, "There is no one who shall pluck out of my hand."'

ROBERT A. AVTOUN.

Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

Luke xv. 30.

THE question of the origin of the Vulgate reading in Lk 15³⁰, 'devoravit substantiam suam,' to which

Mr. Senior drew attention in the March number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, deserves investigation and discussion.

It is not my intention to do this here, but it may be useful to point out that this is the reading of the MS. Add. 14453 (cent. v. or vi.) of the Peshitta Syriac Gospels, which is MS. 14 in Gwilliam's *apparatus criticus* to his Tetraevangelium Sanctum,

where the reading is ܐܬܬܝܬܐܢܐ, 'divitias suas,' instead of the usual Peshitta ܐܬܬܝܬܐܢܐ, 'possessionem tuam.' Gwilliam in his note refers to Payne Smith, Thes. Syr. col. 2375, where the distinction between ܐܬܬܝܬܐܢܐ and ܐܬܬܝܬܐܢܐ is adverted to; then in a quotation from lex. B.A. the sentence occurs 'according to what was said about that prodiga

son who dissipated his riches' (ܐܬܬܝܬܐܢܐ ܐܬܬܝܬܐܢܐ). It may also be pointed out that Aphraates, Dem. 7, 12, De Paenitentibus, referring to the Prodigal Son, says, 'look at the son who dissipated his

riches' (ܐܬܬܝܬܐܢܐ ܐܬܬܝܬܐܢܐ); and a few lines below he says, that his father did not rebuke him 'on account of his riches which he dissipated' (ܐܬܬܝܬܐܢܐ ܐܬܬܝܬܐܢܐ).

Again in 7²³, Aphraates says: 'Remember beloved, the son who dissipated his riches' (ܐܬܬܝܬܐܢܐ ܐܬܬܝܬܐܢܐ). It is clear that Aphraates was acquainted with the passage in the form represented to-day by Gwilliam's MS. 14.

The reading 'his living' is also that of the Coptic, as represented in George Horner's excellent edition. His MS. H, however, as he notes in his *apparatus criticus*, has 'thy living.'

Further, in any discussion of the Vulgate reading, attention should be given to the reading of D which has πάντα in the place of σου τὸν βίον. See Chase, *The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels*, p. 46.

ALBERT BONUS.

Alphington.

Entre Nous.

SOME TOPICS.

The First Principle of Religion.

'WHEREAS Robertson Smith held that religion, reduced to its very lowest terms, must imply at least belief in a god and communion with him,

Frazer considers religion to be the belief that the course of nature and of human life is controlled by personal beings superior to man. By the one view stress is laid on the mystic side of religion, on the communion which is effected through sacrifice; by

other view stress is laid on the power which the gods may be induced by prayer and supplication to exercise for the benefit of man. Our first reflexion, therefore, is that any view of religion, to be comprehensive, cannot confine itself to either of these aspects singly, but must find room for both—for both prayer and sacrifice. They cannot be mutually exclusive, nor can they be simply juxtaposed, though they were atoms unrelated to one another, accidental neighbours in the same district. There must be a higher unity, not created by or consequent to the coalescence of elements originally independent of each other, but a higher unity in which both prayer and sacrifice are manifestations. Higher unity, I venture to suggest, is the first principle of religion; and, if it is not explicitly recognized as the first principle of religion either by Robertson Smith or by Frazer, that may well be because their attention is concentrated on the earlier stages in the evolution of religion, when as yet it is not conspicuous and is, therefore, though in fact operative, liable to be overlooked. As Frazer has said, "first principles of every kind have their influence, and indeed operate largely and powerfully long before they come to the surface of human thought and are articulately expounded." What, then, is the first principle of religion which only after long ages of evolution rises to the surface of human thought, and which, though it had been operative largely and powerfully, came only in the slow course of human evolution to be articulately expounded? The first principle of religion is love—love of one's neighbour and one's God.

That is a statement to be treasured. For it is due, not to a theologian, but to a great authority in the Science of Comparative Religion. Mr. F. Marvin has edited a volume of essays on *Recent developments in European Thought* (Milford; 12s. d. net). He himself writes the introductory survey and sees clear signs of progress. 'Read any account of an English community in the early nineteenth century, say George Eliot's "Milby" in the *Scenes of Clerical Life*. How far more humane, more enlightened, and happier is the state of the succeeding community, the Nuneaton or Coventry of the present day!' Then Professor A. E. Taylor tells what has been done since the Franco-Prussian War in Philosophy. The quotation we have made from the third essay: its title is *The Evolution of Religion*, its author Dr. F. B. Jevons.

The book is of far finer stuff than the volumes of collected papers, so numerous of late, have usually been. Every author can write, and every author can write with authority. Professor Herford writes on Poetry, Mr. G. P. Gooch on History, Mr. A. D. Lindsay on Political Theory, Mr. C. R. Fay on Economic Development, Professor W. H. Bragg on Atomic Theories, Professor Leonard Doncaster on Biology, Mr. A. Clutton-Brock on Art, Dr. Ernest Walker on Music, and Miss F. Melian Stawell on the Modern Renaissance.

SOME TEXTS.

Mt 26⁴⁵.

'Sleep on now and take your rest.' The word translated 'now' is *λοιπόν* (in Mk 14⁴¹ τὸ λοιπόν, but the article is omitted by the editors), which means 'what is left,' 'the remainder.' Our 'now' is from the Vulgate *iam*. Some time ago the meaning was discussed in *Hermathena*, and such translations were suggested as 'the future is for sleep,' or 'sleep out the rest of your sleep.' In the new number of the same annual Dr. W. J. M. Starkie suggests a way out of the difficulty. In modern Greek *λοιπόν* (with or without the article) means 'but,' 'however,' and with an imperative it may be translated 'well, then, if you will.' So we have 'Sleep on then, if you will, and take your rest.'

Mt 28^{2, 4}.

In the same annual Dr. Starkie discusses the 'earthquake' of Mt 28²—'And behold, there was a great earthquake.' No earthquake is mentioned by Mark or Luke. Dr. Starkie believes that the earthquake in Matthew is due to a mistranslation. In v.⁴ we read, 'and for fear of him the watchers did quake' (R.V.). As verb and noun are one, Dr. Starkie believes that we should translate v.² simply, 'And there was a great quaking.' The Persian version actually has, 'and there was there great consternation and fear.'

NEW POETRY.

Lady Margaret Sackville.

Mr. Wilfrid Scawen Blunt contributes a preface to *Selected Poems*, by Lady Margaret Sackville (Constable; 6s. net). He says: 'Lady Margaret Sackville is the best in my opinion of our English poetesses, at least of the younger generation. Certainly she is among the most interesting.' He

is pleased that she has returned out of the blind alley of blank verse, 'the common snare of young and ambitious writers of a dozen years ago, and that she has emerged into the daylight of sound rhyme, metre and melody, the three essentials in our English tradition'; for blank verse, he says, 'though it may be poetry, is not really verse at all, even in master hands, say, rather a dignified kind of prose pompous in recitation and for common reading, dull.'

The volume is in three parts—Poems, Dramatic Poems, and Poems 1914-1917. The last are war poems wholly. One of them is that fine poem 'Reconciliation,' quoted already in this magazine. Now let us take one out of the earliest of all, and let it be

THE GHOST.

'Oh! who is this that calls through the grey rain to me?'—

'Oh! it's I you loved, and loved too well, and I've been drowned at sea.'

'But if it's you I loved so well, and if it's you I lost, You who came not as a living man, why come you now as a ghost?'

'Oh! proud and foolish was my heart, but now my pride is done,
I'm but a weary waif, driven through the lone seas, alone.'—

'Oh! many's the time, day out, day in, I called in vain to you,
Now you may knock at my closed door: I shall not let you through.'

'Is there no shelter then for me?' 'Fast bolted is the door.'

'And is your heart all dead to me?' 'Dead as was yours before.'

Comfort you as best you may, drift seaward with the rain—

The heart which died for a living man, wakes not for the dead again!'

Alec de Candole.

A few months ago a volume of essays was published entitled 'The Faith of a Subaltern.' It was written by a lad who fell in battle at the age of twenty-one. It might have been written by a rained and experienced theologian. Now at volume of poems by the same lad has been published. It is entitled *Poems*, by Alec de Candole

(Cambridge: at the University Press; 4s. 6d. net). And taking the two volumes together we have no hesitation in saying that Alec de Candole is the greatest literary phenomenon of the War—greater than Rupert Brooke or any other. We have already reviewed the volume of essays. Of the poetry it will be sufficient to quote the following sonnet, though almost any poem could be quoted as acceptably:

SALISBURY CATHEDRAL.

I prayed here when I faced the future first
Of war and death, that God would grant me power

To serve Him truly, and through best and worst
He would protect and guide me every hour.
And He has heard my prayer, and led me still
Through purging war's grim wondrous revelation
Of fear and courage, death and life, until

I kneel again in solemn adoration
Before Him here, and still black clouds before
Threat as did those which now passed through
are bright;
Therefore, with hope and prayer and praise
once more

I worship Him, and ask that with His might
He still would lead, and I with utter faith
Follow, through life or sharpest pain or death.

Henry W. Clark.

The Rev. Henry W. Clark, D.D., is a theologian and a poet. The union has been accomplished before, but rarely. Let this single poem from *The Watch-Tower* (Chapham & Hall; 3s. 6d. net) prove his possession of the poetic gift. Its title is

THE LOSER'S PRIZE.

Flutter of flags as the victor flies
Over the line—then a rattling fusillade,
Cheer out of cheer, as he takes his prize!

Fame at its noon for him — while, hope
thwarted,
I, who so brave at the forward-signal
started,
Stand shamed in the shade.

Shamed! Not a whit! For I reached *my*
goal
Half the race through, when, at challenge of
despair,

With my heart sprang, courage hot and whole,
At the flung gage, and her vow renewing,
Scorning fate's scornfulness, faint and yet
pursuing,
Not a mote fear to its lair.

From the deep swung God's tide of praise,
Surge and re-surge, o'er the strand of silence
spread,
Lonely and cold, by the crowd at gaze;
Close in my soul I embraced my guerdon—
Manhood proved strong for the lifting of its
burden—
To shame, shame-flushed, fled!

J. B. Kirtlan.

Dr. Ernest J. B. Kirtlan, B.A., B.D., has made an English and modern version of the 'Crucifixion' in the Towneley Mystery Plays. *A Little Drama of the Crucifixion* is his title (Epworth Press; 1s. 3d. net). In a short introduction he tells the story of the Plays. No quotation from the Play is possible, but the sequence which was sung on Easter morning before the Gospel of the Resurrection will give an idea both of the original Latin and of his version:

APOSTLES:

Dic Nobis Maria:
Quid vidisti in via?

MARIA:

Sepulchrum Christi viventis,
Et gloriam vidi resurgentis:
Angelicos testes
Sudarium et vestes.
Surrexit Christus, spes mea:
Praecedet vos
In Galileam.

APOSTLES:

Scimus Christum surrexisse
A mortuis vere:
In nobis victor
Rex miserere!

Anglicized it would be:

APOSTLES:

What sawest thou, Mary, say,
As thou wentest on thy way?

MARY:

I saw the tomb wherein
The living Christ had lain.
I saw His glory
As He rose again:
Napkins and linen clothes
And angels twain.
Yea, Christ is risen,
My hope: and He
Will go before
To Galilee.

APOSTLES:

We know that Christ
Has risen from the grave:
Hail, King of Victory!
Have mercy, Lord, and save.

Edmond Holmes.

Mr. T. J. Cobden-Sanderson has selected and arranged *Sonnets and Poems* by Edmond Holmes (Cobden-Sanderson; 6s. net), and has published them with this Introduction: 'Adoration has been from earliest days—the farthest in retrospect—a function of humanity, but the object has changed with the years. In Religion it has been God—in how many shapes! In Art, Beauty: in Science—its uses! To-day the object is split up into things innumerable. Who shall gather the separated rays into one glory infinite? Who or what? The transformed Science of the Universe—transformed into Vision, the Ecstasies of Cosmic Love, adorative and sympathetically creative? is that the coming æons' Divinity?

'The Sonnets and Poems gathered together into this Anthology would seem to attempt an answer to this insurgent question, and with this tentative indication of their purpose and meaning they may be left to make their own appeal, direct to the reader.'

The reader probably knows already what he will find, for Edmond Holmes the poet can scarcely have escaped his notice. If he does not, a surprise is his, and in either case an exquisite pleasure. The difficulty of the reviewer is to make *his* selection. The sonnets are as the poems and the poems as the sonnets, and there is not a weak line in the one or the other; there is scarcely an inadequate image, there is certainly not an unworthy thought.

The Epilogue is the poets' creed. Take the end of it:

The sun is high in the heaven: the flush has faded away:

But my heart is aflame for ever with the dawn of a larger day.

Let the years bring joy or sorrow: let Fate send glory or gloom:

I fear no shadow of darkness: I fear no presage of doom.

I have guessed the secret of being: I have probed the meaning of death:

I know why we wake from slumber: I know why we draw life's breath.

I have read the riddle of evil,—the riddle of passion and pain:

I know that no heart has striven or sighed or suffered in vain.

I am clasped to the breast of Nature: I glide where her waters glide:

And I feel, as each ripple rocks me, the swing of the world's one tide.

The sun has climbed to the zenith, but his light has died from the skies:

There is fear at the heart of Nature, and a mist of tears in her eyes:

Dark as despair the storm-clouds in sad procession move:—

But my heart is aflame for ever with the dawn of the light of love.

Vera M. Brittain.

From the poets represented in *Oxford Poetry, 1919* (Blackwell; 1s. 6d. net), we choose Vera M. Brittain. Her poem, 'To a V.C.,' is thoughtful and expressive. The volume on the whole is scarcely up to the high mark of previous volumes. Has the end of the war brought the end of inspiration? It is rather that the pause has come between the fierce agony and the new life. With the quiet of the time at hand and the memory of the time that is past we shall reach higher things:

Because your feet were stayed upon that road
Whereon the others swiftly came and passed,
Because the harvest you and they had sowed
You only reaped at last.

Tis not your valour's meed alone you bear
Who stand the object of a nation's pride,
For on that humble Cross you live to wear
Your friends were crucified.

They shared with you the conquest over fear,
Sublime self-disregard, decision's power,
But Death, relentless, left you lonely here
In recognition's hour.

Their sign is yours to carry to the end;
The lost reward of gallant hearts as true
As yours they called their leader and their friend
Is worn for them by you.

Ruth Pitter.

First Poems (Cecil Palmer; 2s. 6d. net) should be tenderly handled. But these poems by Ruth Pitter are not the first poems of ordinary poets. It would not be true to say that there are no immaturities, but whether of form or idea they are quite surprisingly few. The clearest sign of youth is the frequent appearance of the fairy or the fay. But what do you say to this?

THE CONSUMMATION.

Looks royal, songs for heaven meet,
Thou wishest, thinking on his worth
Whose faintest image is more sweet
Than all thy dearest loves on earth.

The royal look is marred with years,
The song celestial is made
Into a litany of tears,
Into a blossom of the shade.

Thou art fordone: thine heart is rent
To praise who hath no fear nor shame,
Yet when thine utmost life is spent
Thou hast not even said his name:

But peace, the triumph is not ripe.
Canst thou not sleep a little space,
Or dream upon the oaten pipe
Till there appear the wished face?

Then well sufficing shall arise
From thy quiet heart that was so wrung,
A look in those translated eyes,
A word in that diviner tongue.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.